DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 956 HE 014 457

TITLE	The Dean as Colleague: Dean, Student, Faculty, Administrative Relationship. A Compilation of Presentations from the Executive Development Series I: "Have You Ever Thought of Being a Dean?" (1980-1981). Volume III.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges of Nursing, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Public Health Service (DHHS), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE	Jul 81
GRANT	PHS-5-D10-NU-23035-02
NOTE	82p.; For related documents, see HE 014 455-458.
AVAILABLE FROM	Project Office, American Association of Colleges of Nursing, Eleven Dupont Circle, Suite 430, Washington, DC 20036 ($6.50).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Deans; Academic Education; Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Responsibility; College Students; Departments; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Relationship; Interprofessional Relationship; Leadership Responsibility; Nurses; *Nursing Education; Peer Relationship; Physicians; Program Administration; *Role Perception; School Community Relationship; *Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Collegiality

ABSTRACT

The relationships of deans of baccalaureate or higher degree programs of nursing with faculty members, administrators, students, other professionals, and the public are considered by six deans who contributed to a continuing education workshop series. According to Edith H. Anderson, the dean is a colleague of other deans, and to students and junior faculty members the dean is a role model. Leadership and management are shared with mid-level administrators and senior faculty members while providing for progressively responsible participation of junior faculty and students. Doris A. Geitgey believes the effective collegial relationship is founded on mutual understanding, respect, and trust, and that the most important colleagues of a dean are the faculty members. Collegial relationships with other deans, higher level administrators, nursing service personnel, physicians, and students also are addressed. Virginia R. Jarratt suggests that there are distinctions in the role of dean with different groups; the role is sometimes formal, sometimes informal, and sometimes situational. Relationships with other administrators, faculty, students, and the public are considered. Georgie C. Labadie proposes that deans can foster positive relationships with students and provide a role model for faculty to promote shared university governance. The importance of collegial relationships with other deans, and relationships with administrators and faculty are addressed. According to Marion M. Schrum, the level of collegiality varies substantively with the dean's administrative style and is influenced by the size and structure of the school. Among the concerns addressed by Anna M. Shannon are a theory of interpersonal relations, and assessment of one's beliefs about self, others, role, and institutions. Bibliographies are included. (SW)

ED210956

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT SERIES I "HAVE YOU EVER THOUGHT OF BEING A DEAN?"

THE DEAN AS COLLEAGUE: Dean, Student, Faculty, Administrative Relationships

Volume III
July 1981

Table of Contents
Preface
Ann M. Douglas, *Project Director*
Acknowledgements
Series Overview
Cecelia M. Cunilio, *Assistant Project Director*
Introduction
Ann M. Douglas
Presentations:
Edith H. Anderson
University of Delaware

Doris A. Geitgey
University of Kansas

Virginia R. Jarratt
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences

Georgie C. Labadie
Florida A & M University

Marion M. Schrum
University of Nevada, Reno

Anna M. Shannon
Montana State University
Final Word
Marion I. Murphy, *AACN Executive Director*
List of Participants

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

American Assn. of Colleges of Nursing

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NE014 457

Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project
American Association of Colleges of Nursing

aacn

The Executive Development Series I was made possible by the Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project supported in part by the United States Public Health Service (GRANT #5 D10 NU 23035-02). A Project of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, the Executive Development Series was launched in April 1980.

The American Association of Colleges of Nursing was established in 1969 to answer the need for a national organization exclusively devoted to furthering the goals of baccalaureate and graduate education in nursing. Its membership includes almost 300 institutions offering degree programs in professional nursing.

This volume is part of a four volume monograph series on the role of the contemporary dean of nursing. The four publications include presentations from six regional Executive Development Series workshops.

For more information on the Executive Development Series, or copies of the four monographs, contact the Project Office, American Association of Colleges of Nursing, Suite 430, Eleven Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 332-0214.

Volume Price: $6.50; Series Price: $20.00
Copyright, American Association of Colleges of Nursing, 1981

The Dean As Colleague:
Dean, Student, Faculty, Administrative Relationships

A compilation of presentations from the
Executive Development Series I:
"Have You Ever Thought of Being a Dean?"

1980–1981

Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project
American Association of Colleges of Nursing

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface Ann M. Douglas, Project Director	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Series Overview Cecelia M. Cunilio, Assistant Project Director	ix
Introduction Ann M. Douglas	xvii
Presentations:	
Edith H. Anderson University of Delaware	1
Doris A. Geitgey University of Kansas	11
Virginia R. Jarratt University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	18
Georgie C. Labadie Florida A&M University	26
Marion M. Schrum University of Nevada, Reno	39
Anna M. Shannon Montana State University	45
Final Word Marion I. Murphy, AACN Executive Director	57
List of Participants	59

Preface

More than a decade ago a group of distinguished and concerned deans gathered together to form an organization devoted to the preservation and continued development of professional nursing. That group formed the nucleus of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing. As members of the profession of nursing they shared a concern for excellence in practice. As academic administrators they shared a concern for improving the effectiveness of educational programs preparing for professional practice. As leaders they assumed the responsibility of identifying problem areas, indicating directions for alternative solutions, and assisting in the developmental process of potential leaders. Their numbers increased until presently the AACN membership totals almost three hundred.

The same commitment to ensuring quality care, the same determination to provide outstanding educational programs, the same pursuit and development of potential leaders prevail today. As the organization grew, so did its sphere of influence. As its membership increased, so did its ability to make an impact on selected areas for change and growth. One of those areas was the identification and counseling of potential leaders for academic administrative positions. Through the combined efforts of a Task Force on Dean's Preparation and guidance by the executive director, a special project, "Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators," was drawn up and submitted to the United States Public Health Service, Division of Nursing, for approval and funding. It was approved and funded. The task force then assumed the role of advisory committee and assisted the staff in implementing the project. This monograph series is one consequence of that effort.

One of the outcomes of the project was the design and implementation of an Executive Development Series. The purpose of the initial series was to orient interested professionals in the role and functions of the chief academic administrator in a department or college of nursing. The scope of the position being as broad as it is, certain limitations in content had to be established to allow for learning. A review of position descriptions, as well as concerns of search committees, indicated that two of the dean's roles were significant--those of administrator and of scholar. Faculty members indicated that colleagueship was essential. Conspicuous by its absence was the factor of the simple humanness of the individual who functioned as dean. These four major areas then composed the nature and direction of Executive Development Series I.

To demonstrate that within the position there is unity in essentials, as well as diversity in accidentals, six deans from various regions across the country were asked to address one of each of the four issues. In all, 24 academic administrators present their views. There are four monographs in the series:

I. The Dean As Administrator
II. The Dean As Scholar
III. The Dean As Colleague
IV. The Dean As Person

Each monograph will bring you the reflections of six deans on a chosen topic. The deans are diverse in preparation, style, and affiliation. They have one thing in common. They lead successful programs in nursing. That is their professional raison d'être. For those of you whose goal is academic administration we present our first Executive Development Series.

Ann M. Douglas
Project Director

Acknowledgements

As part of the AACN's Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project, the Executive Development Series--and this resultant monograph--were guided by the vision of an eight-member advisory committee of deans. Together they worked to realize one of nursing education's long-time dreams--formal executive development for its chief administrators. The committee comprises the following:

Geraldene Felton
University of Iowa

Louise Fitzpatrick
Villanova University

Sylvia E. Hart
University of Tennessee at Knoxville

Juanita Murphy
Arizona State University

Marie O'Koren
University of Alabama

June S. Rothberg
Adelphi University

Gladys Sorensen
University of Arizona

Jeannette R. Spero
University of Cincinnati

Special support was provided by three consultants chosen for their expertise and experience in top-level university administration. They helped facilitate the project's progress and aided immeasurably toward the workshops' success. Their names and the positions they held at the time they began working with the series follow:

Shirley Chater
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of California, San Francisco

Carolyne Davis
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Michigan

Jeanne Margaret McNally
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
General Administration
University of North Carolina.

Series Overview

The Executive Development Series was designed as career preparation for the nurse educator, clinician, or administrator considering a career as an academic administrator of a baccalaureate or higher degree program in nursing. The series is part of the AACN's Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project which is working to create a national continuing education system to enlarge the supply of capable academic administrators--a population which, in the 1980s, finds itself in short supply.

OBJECTIVES

Executive Development Series I, "Have You Ever Thought of Being A Dean?" attempted to offer workshop candidates a unique opportunity to review, with the help of the series faculty--outstanding academic administrators from across the country--the various roles today's nursing dean must play. Emphasis rested on strategies to achieve positive institutional, faculty, student and personal relationships. Participants had the chance to do the following:

- identify the dean's role in implementing a baccalaureate or higher degree program in nursing,
- examine the intra- and extra-institutional factors which influence the dean's responsibilities and attributes,
- identify alternative models for establishing a method of operation within the territory of deanship, and
- explore the major educational challenges for nursing administrators in the 1980s.

FORMAT

In designing the series curriculum, four major roles were identified as part of the dean's realm of performance: the dean as administrator, scholar, colleague, and person. Surveying the population of successful deans (both present and past) it was noted that each of the four roles was marked by a variety of styles; they were areas replete with personal differences.

The purpose of Executive Development Series I was orientation to the demands of the dean's role. We well knew that the role, for most junior and senior faculty members (and some deans themselves) is seriously misunderstood. A candidate approaching a deanship for the first time does so overwhelmed by the demands of the position. Few have the chance to understand, via one-to-one conversation or close observation, what a dean actually does to fulfill her admittedly gargantuan duties. The dean is, for many, a far-off, intangible model of excellence, power, scholarliness, efficiency, or sheer genius.

We knew that the misconceptions are many and that the program we developed could assume only one common perception--that the position of dean is a seemingly overwhelming one. And a corollary to this widespread attitude seemed to be the increasing fall-off rate from deanships. Always before us were the growing numbers of deans leaving their positions, not being reappointed, or being relieved of their positions by administrative fiat. Many of these deans had gone into their positions not knowing what to expect. The Executive Development Series I, "Have You Ever Thought Of Being A Dean?" attempted to orient, on an important albeit limited basis, a new generation to the real demands of the position.

At the same time we decided that, to provide the greatest service, the series had to offer participants a hands-on, no-nonsense look at the deanship--an examination which would help the participant make an important assessment of her/his own personal values, qualities, and needs vis-a-vis the experiences of a variety of successful deans. The more direct the interaction between participants and series faculty members the better.

The format which eventually evolved was a two-day workshop, followed by a six-month interim for independent study, followed by another two-day workshop. The hallmark of the series was a built-in mentorship mechanism which would allow a participant to work closely with one of the series faculty members in small groups during the two workshops and, in the interim period, via phone calls or personal visits. The format was also designed to encourage participant interaction with all of the series faculty members as well as with other participants. A serendipitous effect of any workshop is the informal networking which develops unnoticed. With a combined six-month series experience planned we were hopeful that both the mentoring and networking mechanisms would have ample time to take root.

SERIES FACULTY MEMBERS

In an effort to emphasize the various styles of deaning, we decided that the workshops should afford an examination of the dean's four major roles from the vantage points of two deans. That meant a total of eight deans, two each to speak to the four different roles.

Budget constraints allowed us to offer only three regional series across the country--in the East, Midwest, and West. Consequently, eight deans were chosen for each of the three regional series: four deans to present at the first workshop and four to present at the second. As it evolved, the first workshop included presentations from the vantage point of newer administrators (in the deanship eight or fewer years) while the latter offered the views of the more seasoned executives (ten years or more as a dean). However, all eight series faculty members would be actively involved in each workshop and would direct a group of from five to ten participants throughout the series.

Series faculty members were chosen for their successful performance as deans. In addition to fulfilling the obligations of their demanding positions, they were being asked to serve as role models and mentors for series participants over, and in many cases beyond, the six-months series experience. These faculty members, by region, are listed below:

Eastern Region	Midwestern Region	Western Region
Edith H. Anderson University of Delaware "The Dean As Colleague"	Doris A. Geitgy University of Kansas "The Dean As Colleague"	Rheba de Tornyay University of Washington "The Dean As Person"
Olga Andruskiw Russell Sage College "The Dean As Scholar"	Elizabeth Grossman Indiana University "The Dean As Administrator"	Patty L. Hawken University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio "The Dean As Administrator"
Donna Diers Yale University "The Dean As Scholar"	Elizabeth C. Harkins University of Southern Mississippi "The Dean As Person"	Carol A. Lindeman University of Oregon Health Sciences Center at Portland "The Dean As Scholar
Nan B. Hechenberger University of Maryland at Baltimore "The Dean As Administrator"	Virginia R. Jarratt University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences "The Dean As Colleague"	Mary E. Reres University of California, Los Angeles "The Dean As Administrator"
Georgie C. Labadie Florida A&M University "The Dean As Colleague"	Peggy J. Ledbetter Northwestern State University "The Dean As Scholar"	Marion M. Schrum University of Nevada, Reno "The Dean As Colleague"
Andrea R. Lindell University of New Hampshire "The Dean As Person"	Jannetta MacPhail Case Western Reserve University "The Dean As Scholar"	Anna M. Shannon Montana State University "The Dean As Colleague"
Fostine G. Riddick Hampton Institute "The Dean As Person"	Valencia N. Prock Center for Health Sciences University of Wisconsin- Madison "The Dean As Administrator"	Marilyn Christian Smith Loma Linda University "The Dean As Scholar"
Doris B. Yingling Medical College of Virginia Virginia Commonwealth University "The Dean As Administrator"	Julia A. Lane Loyola University of Chicago "The Dean As Person"	Carmen Westick University of New Mexico "The Dean As Person"

To kick off each workshop we asked some of nursing's finest educators and leaders to introduce the series at each workshop location. These speakers were as follows:

Eastern Region	Midwestern Region	Western Region
Baltimore, Maryland Marion I. Murphy AACN	Indianapolis, Indiana Mary K. Mullane Formerly University of Illinois at the Medical Center	Portland, Oregon Myrtle K. Aydelotte American Nurses Association
Richmond, Virginia Rose Chioni University of Virginia	Cleveland, Ohio Rozella Schlotfeldt Case Western Reserve University	San Antonio, Texas Billye J. Brown University of Texas-Austin

We also put together a team of expert consultants to evaluate the series' success in meeting the objectives outlined. We asked them to help us determine if we were doing what we set out to do, how we could do it better, and whether, in fact, the series' objectives and format were appropriate to the task of enlarging the pool of qualified executives. All held positions at top-level university administration at the time we selected them. They were

Eastern Region	Midwestern Region	Western Region
Jeanne Margaret McNally Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs General Administration University of North Carolina	Carolyne Davis Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs University of Michigan	Shirley Chater Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs University of California, San Francisco

SCHEDULING AND WORKSHOP AGENDA

Locations and dates for each of the six regional workshops were identified. In each case a major school of nursing committed to cosponsor the workshop in its city. As cosponsors the schools agreed to provide administrative support in workshop logistics and to act as crediting agencies in the award of CEU credit to successful workshop candidates. In one case a school, the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, actually hosted the workshop in its facility. The series schedule and cosponsoring schools of nursing were as follows:

Eastern Region	Midwestern Region	Western Region
Baltimore, Maryland April 28-29, 1980 School of Nursing University of Maryland at Baltimore	Indianapolis, Indiana October 16-17, 1980 School of Nursing Indiana University	Portland, Oregon September 22-23, 1980 School of Nursing University of Oregon Health Sciences Center at Portland
Richmond, Virginia October 27-28, 1980 School of Nursing Medical College of Virginia Virginia Commonwealth University	Cleveland, Ohio April 27-18, 1981 Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing Case Western Reserve University	San Antonio, Texas March 30-31, 1981 School of Nursing University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

The workshop agenda was designed to allow time for formal presentations, questions for the presentators, small group discussion, one-to-one group interaction between participants and their mentors, interaction with other series faculty members, and informal networking among participants, both within and beyond established mentor groups. A typical agenda for the two-day workshop looked like this:

FIRST DAY		SECOND DAY	
8:00-9:00 a.m.	Registration	8:00-8:15 a.m.	Plan for second day
9:00-9:30 a.m.	Welcome	8:15-9:00 a.m.	The Dean as Colleague: Dean, Student, Faculty, Administrative Relationships
9:30-10:15 a.m.	The Dean as Administrator: Roles, Functions and Attributes	9:00-9:30 a.m.	General Discussion: Third Paper
10:15-10:45 a.m.	General Discussion: First Paper	9:30-10:00 a.m.	Break
10:45-11:00 a.m.	Break	10:00-11:15 a.m.	Work Session III: Problems and issues related to the dean as colleague
11:00-12:15 p.m.	Work Session I: Problems and issues related to the dean as administrator	11:15-1:15 p.m.	Lunch on your own
12:15-2:15 p.m.	Catered Luncheon	1:15-2:00 p.m.	The Dean as Person: Rights and responsibilities
2:15-3:00 p.m.	The Dean as Scholar: Clinical Competence, Teaching, Research and Publication	2:00-2:30 p.m.	General Discussion: Fourth Paper
3:00-3:30 p.m.	General Discussion: Second Paper	2:30-3:00 p.m.	Break
3:30-4:00 p.m.	Break	3:00-4:15 p.m.	Work Session IV: Problems and Issues related to the dean as person
4:00-5:15 p.m.	Work Session II: Problems and Issues related to the dean as scholar	4:15-4:45 p.m.	Summary

PARTICIPANTS

News of the series program was sent directly to all four-year nursing programs across the country and to major nursing and educational periodicals. Registration was limited to prospective and new nurse academic administrators. All registrants were asked to submit a current curriculum vitae for review of pertinent qualifications and experience for assignment to a specific mentor and group.

The promotional brochure emphasized the series' design as a three-component (workshop, interim study, workshop) learning experience covering approximately six months. Despite this emphasis, however, participants unable to complete the full series were given the option of attending only one workshop.

A complete roster of participants is listed at the back of this volume. The number of participants attending the regional workshops is included here. The significantly lower western regional figures reflect the fewer number of nursing programs in the western states:

Workshops	No. of Participants	% of Participants Attending Both Workshops
Eastern:		
Baltimore, MD	63	
Richmond, VA	67	
	130	66%
Midwestern:		
Indianapolis, IN	63	
Cleveland, OH	45	
	108	54%
Western:		
Portland, OR	30	
San Antonio, TX	35	
	65	53%

As of this time a significant number of participants have earned an Executive Development Series Certificate for attending both workshops and for completing, with the guidance of their mentor, an independent study project.

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP

All workshop participants were asked to complete a four-page evaluation form before leaving the workshop site. Based upon an approximately 98 percent return the series was deemed very successful in helping participants to evaluate (a) their perceptions of the deanship and (b) their own intentions about assuming the position. Some participants came looking for the ABCs to deaning; they were disappointed to find that there aren't any. Others, who came expecting a qualifications list for the potential dean, were also disappointed. Some participants found it difficult to operate within the workshops' informal, open-ended structure. Others found it disappointing not to be able to work closely with more than one series faculty member. Interestingly enough, the latter two concerns, although often voiced by participants at their first workshop, were not raised after their second workshop. At the second workshop, they felt comfortable enough with both their mentors and with other group participants to use the series' format for what it was designed--serious reflection and productive group interaction.

For all participants the series' mentoring and networking mechanisms were extraordinary. The workshops provided a supportive, nonthreatening atmosphere in which participants could voice their concerns about their professional development and could share experiences. One participant (Dr. Ivy Nelson, Chairperson of the University of the District of Columbia Department of Nursing) wrote, "One cannot wish experiences to be retroactive. However, I believe that my life and performance as a nursing administrator could have been enhanced if programs of this kind were in effect during the formative years of my career. The greatest benefit to me is that of recognizing that my experiences as an administrator have not been unique."

In October 1980 Dr. Olga Andruskiw, one of our eastern series faculty members, raised an important motion at AACN's semiannual membership meeting in Washington. Dr. Andruskiw moved that AACN membership invite series participants to attend one upcoming membership meeting each as observers, in an effort to extend a collegial helping hand to these future deans and directors. The membership supported the motion and issued an invitation unprecedented in AACN's history. At the March 1981 membership meeting the first set of series participants heeded the invitation and were formally recognized as future leaders in nursing education. A total of 30 participants attended; 9 of them were or are now serving as chief executives of their schools. An invitation to attend the next semiannual meeting, in October, has already been extended to participants of the midwestern and western regional workshops.

Project plans call for periodic follow-up of all participants in an attempt to chart their professional development and to ascertain the impact, if any, of the series on their careers.

Cecelia M. Cunilio
Assistant Project Director

Introduction

Thoreau wrote "I never found the companion that was so companionable as solitude." Many a dean must have harbored similar thoughts as she carefully maneuvered a path through the academic year, relating in one way or another to students, staff members, faculty members, administrators, alumni, community agency members, other professionals, family, friends, the general public, and sundry other living creatures great and small. Of all the obligations of the dean, one of the most sensitive and crucial may be that of responsible colleagueship. To whom is the dean colleague? When is she colleague? Is she colleague? What do we really mean when we talk about the dean as colleague? If indeed the appropriate and productive functioning of the school is the responsibility ultimately of the dean, what specific collegial relationships must she cultivate to achieve the ends for which the school was established? Since the dean serves at the pleasure of the president, how does she establish and maintain those significant relationships essential to the co-equal, cooperative, and unique status of the school on campus?

Through the years in nursing education our professional colleagues banded together to work cooperatively for the well-being of our profession. We, in a sense, formed a benevolent and protective association. It was for the most part a close and closed system. Our deans had little freedom. But we have come of age. We are special and we have something special to offer. That something originates today in our colleges of nursing--guided by our deans. To ensure that the outstanding formation, development, and professional practice of the graduates become a part of informal public knowledge, our deans must propagate that knowledge effectively. Our deans must personify that special excellence. And we must give them the freedom to do so--each in her own way. So when it comes to the question of colleagueship, each dean must chart her own course. Although the end is the same, each course will vary. The success of the dean will depend upon her ability plus our understanding, acceptance, and assistance.

Ann M. Douglas
Project Director

According to Edith H. Anderson . . .

It is pleasant to contemplate the best of two worlds: the dean as a colleague is such a happy contemplation. Those of you aspiring to the role of dean may hold the notion that you can keep your faculty status and become a dean, thus creating for yourself the best of two worlds.

Before I interrupt your reverie, let me start with definitions and limitations. In a sense we are all colleagues for, by definition, a colleague is an associate in a profession. But accepting that definition does not differentiate the special role that each of us plays in achieving the goals of the profession. It is my contention that the role of the dean inhibits many collegial relations.

The collegial model, by definition, is the vesting of authority equally among colleagues. At this state of the profession and academic nursing, it is an illusion to think that a collegial model of administration exists in colleges of nursing.

My focus is limited to deans of colleges of nursing in university settings. The role of chairperson or head of a nursing program differs from that of a college dean both in status and administrative accountability based upon the size and complexity of the organization.

I am drawing upon a brief survey of faculty members, studies of the role of the dean, and upon my reflections as a dean in a public and now in a private university. To begin, let's examine the setting and how one gets into and out of the role of dean. Then, let's turn attention to factors that inhibit the collegial model within the college and university.

Nursing is firmly established in university settings. (Not that we are totally accepted, understood, or appreciated by everyone.) But to the pioneering generation who led the way into university education and to the next generations who established the scholarly base for nursing, we owe a debt. Until recently, the dean of the college of nursing on many university campuses was the highest-ranking woman in the university. While the picture is changing as women gain status in educational administration, we have a right to be exhilarated by our success.

Because the role of dean is relatively new in nursing's history, we lack a solid base of research in examining the unique feature of the role and in examining the comparable components of the role in other fields. (I am going to end with suggestions for a research model which AACN might sponsor in the future.)

In each university, the requirements of the position of dean of a college depends upon the stage of the college's internal development, the

---

Edith H. Anderson, Ph.D., F.A.A.N., is dean, College of Nursing, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.

opportunities presented by its environment, and its place in the university's overall program. As the college evolves, the requirements of the role change. The style and talents of the dean may match the needs of the college at a particular time but may be mismatched at another time. For some deans, the initiating, building, expansion phase of a college is exciting; for others the construction of a building, development of research, curriculum innovation, and theory development can be a challenge.

Colleges have a history which does not go away. A college may have had consistent leadership and become outstanding; for others the course is uneven, with stages of being barely able to keep its accreditation, faculty, students or dean. Unless initiating a new program, a new dean is heir to the past; she will learn about predecessor's achievements, her foibles and follies, her friends and enemies. I hope that you will be genuinely empathetic to the state of the college which resulted from your predecessor's and colleague's best efforts.

The role of the dean encompasses leadership and administration. The dean interprets the profession and its goals to the university community and works to raise the standards of the college so that it meets the expectations of the university, the profession, and the community for quality teaching, research, and scholarship.

As a leader, the dean endeavors to get people with diverse views and interests to cooperate in reaching common goals. The dean is an educational leader who can speak clearly to nursing science, curriculum, research, and health care. As an administrator of a large number of personnel and of a large budget, often of more than a million dollars derived from multiple sources, the dean needs management skills to match the organization. But above all, the dean must have an unwavering view of what the college is to accomplish in its short- and long-range plans. Her job is to keep people and resources on track in reaching goals.

Let's turn our attention to getting in and out of the role of dean. With few exceptions, deans of colleges of nursing come from nursing faculties. The dean has experienced the faculty role and upward mobility through the ranks. This experience included progressive responsibility, such as chairing committees at the college and university level, dealing with promotion and tenure, peer review, curriculum, budget, grievance, and student advising. Almost always deans of colleges of nursing have gained prominence through research, writing, consultation, teaching, and giving papers. They have held elected offices and are active in professional associations on state and national levels. They qualify for appointments as full professors.

Every newcomer to a role of dean experiences stages in the acceptance of leadership. If you survive the selection process, you will go through the first well known stage, the honeymoon. During this lovely period, everyone wants to like you and you want to like everyone. You form a network of relationships that will last you for a long time. Within the college new groups form; some support you, some sit back waiting for you to solve all the problems, some know you can't and retreat to

nostalgia about the good old days. There will never be a time when problems are as crystalized. You will listen to a litany of problems: the origin, history, and magic solution from individuals and groups.

Having heard all of this, the dean lays the groundwork for change. With proper care, you set in motion a new salary scale, reorganization, revision of the curriculum, a research center, grant proposals. Everyone starts out with enthusiasm; new people join the college excited about the goals of the college and their contribution. There are regressions and retreats, but things come together and plans are implemented.

And then, everyone starts to complain about the things you have attempted to remedy. An intriguing study of 184 deans of Ivy League colleges(1) shows that deans' satisfaction with the job peaks during the first six years of service. The focal point of dissatisfaction comes from faculty unrest and their demands for more and more.

How long-term deans survive and adjust once more to the demands of faculty for change, we just don't know. The fine-tuning of the goals of the college involves assessing your own past mistakes and taking into account trends in the profession and changes in the university and community.

One way to fine-tune the administration of a college is to schedule a periodic evaluation of the dean by students, graduates, faculty members, and other deans. The University of Delaware does follow such a plan in evaluating all administrators every five years(2). Sample confidential opinions and a self-evaluation report are used to identify strengths and weaknesses in the administration of the college. A committee is set up by the provost to interview faculty about discrepancies and to come up with recommendations for improvement and for renewal of the dean's appointment for another five years.

I suspect that at about the time that faculty unrest increases and the dean's satisfaction decreases, deans may decide to make a lateral move to another position as dean. Again, we don't know if the second position as dean is more satisfactory to the individual or what criteria are used to select the second position.

On the average of about twice a week, most deans consider that they have adequate reasons to resign. In nursing, these peaks may just match the number of job offers you receive. It is my observation from seeing the aftermath of a number of resignations of capable and well liked university administrators that a hasty resignation solves nothing. While you may remove yourself from the situation in which you had some power to act, after the dramatic resignation everyone else is faced with working out the problem under a new stress.

Deans may be removed from an administrative position at any time. Usually deans have appointments as tenured professors in a department; some have survived the removal and stayed on the faculty. My guess is that the stress quotient in that situation was high. Deans cannot remove anyone from a position without concern for due process. Removing someone from an administrative position within the college is the prerogative of the dean, but consultation with faculty and the provost are necessary to maintain the smooth functioning of the organization.

Some few deans have moved to the upper echelons of higher education in either line or staff positions. In other disciplines, the dean of the college speaks for the discipline; in nursing, I think that we are so exhilarated by our success that we seek the highest-ranking academic nurse to represent nursing. It may be that it is difficult for nurses to maintain specialized areas of knowledge except in the political arena, and thus they overshadow the accepted role of the dean.

In nursing, ex-deans do not fit back on the faculty as a good colleague should. Nothing discourages a candidate for a dean's position as much as the realization that one or two ex-deans have tenure on the faculty. Now ask yourself, why do we respond this way? Some answers that I have gathered are that the new dean would have to cope with competition for leadership, the friendship and gossip patterns of the previous regime, the ex-dean's lack of teaching content except in educational administration, for which there are no students.

The elan of an organization is revealed often by the way previous deans fared at the hands of the faculty, administration, and community. Getting into and out of the role of the dean emphasizes the unique features of the role that set you aside from faculty colleagues.

Let's look at the governance of colleges of nursing. Perhaps aspiring deans have in mind an ideal faculty--a group of senior faculty members who willingly share setting the goals and directions of the college with you. You see the dean as a colleague among a group of outstanding teachers who are excellent clinicians and noted researchers publishing regularly. In this lofty atmosphere, it is easy to absorb junior faculty who are seeking mentors as they launch their careers.

While the statistics could be used to cast a cold light on the picture of faculty composition, recall your own experience in colleges of nursing. If 5 to 25 percent of the faculty of colleges of nursing hold the doctorate or are at the senior level, the college is unusual and fortunate. From this pool of senior faculty members, the dean must draw the next line of management--the associate or assistant deans, department chairpersons, team leaders.

Building and maintaining a support system in the college is a major task for the dean of a college of nursing. If the dean can draw upon people with administrative education and experience, the option of delegating responsibility is facilitated. The orientation of assistant deans and department chairpersons takes at least two years. Delegation of responsibility has to be gradual and requires the unfailing support of the dean if the person on the front line facing faculty and students is to learn the job, stay on the job, and gain satisfaction from doing an effective job. Clarifying line authority and overlap in roles is an ongoing effort of the dean as individuals grow in administrative positions and interact with one another.

In colleges other than nursing, the department chairperson position is looked upon as a temporary one in which a faculty member serves for a while before returning full time to his interests--teaching and research. In nursing, all administrative positions are looked upon as high-status positions by faculty and students. Studies indicate that deans recommend

initiation into administration via the chairperson route. And yet, we have devoted little attention to the satisfaction, stress, and development of this role.

The study of 184 deans of colleges in Ivy League universities(3) revealed that job satisfaction for associate and assistant deans peaked at about four years, two years earlier than that of deans. Most associate deans in this study found that they were not equal with the deans but were assistants, if not "gophers" ("go fir this" or "go fir that"). In a nursing study of 127 associate or assistant deans(4) impediments to full role development were also noted, particularly in the overlap of functions for faculty development, evaluation, and program responsibility. This study pointed out that deans in nursing tend not to delegate authority for budget management and personnel decisions.

Another study of 109 nursing education administrators(5) indicated that decisions pertaining to administration, faculty affairs, and research are being made by the faculty and the administration with shared authority. Decisions pertaining to curriculum are being made by the faculty, with faculty primacy. Although the faculty is involved in all areas of decision making, the nurse administrators are the main decision makers in the area of resources and procedures for obtaining faculty members.

The results of this study do not clarify the active part played by deans in curriculum leadership, particularly in conceptualization based upon model building and innovation. The impetus to curriculum change and the momentum required to implement a new curriculum within the resources of the college requires the active support of the dean.

Studies as well as anecdotes(6) that I have gleaned do reveal that it is a central trait of deans to keep control of the total budget. With much fanfare, a dean will delegate responsibility for budget within defined limits so that the margin of possible error is small. Perhaps this strategy saves the dean's mental health; perhaps the dean needs to maintain the position of rewarder who divides up the money among the units responsible to her while keeping a way to make up the oversights and errors.

In contrast to other colleges, colleges of nursing are tightly structured. The tendency on the part of the faculty is to write bylaws, formulate the functions of committees in detail, keep explicit minutes of meetings, circulate everything to one and all, and write policies and rules for every possible contingency. Much of the work that is done is procedural rather than substantive. Hours of valuable time go into these codifying activities. The dean and other administrators are forced into helping people move out of a morass of detail.

It may be that this focus on internal structure results in part from the highly cohesive undergraduate curriculum in nursing and the articulation of the master's and doctoral programs' curricula. Team teaching and cooperation in curriculum revision may be spilling over into attempts to control all aspects of the internal organization with the stricture of rules. Without question, colleges of nursing produce some of the most detailed documents in the university.

Nursing faculties are coming into their own in understanding their role in the governance of the college and university, but often they are not grappling with issues--the shift in student population, the no-growth phase in universities, apathy and renewal in times of fiscal retrenchment. Rather they are stuck on internal management by structuring and controlling.

The composition of the faculty affects the governance of a college. Nursing has a large portion of instructors who come directly from the master's program, which included little background in higher education. Decision making is slowed and often hampered by their lack of information. The dean and senior faculty members participate in a formal and informal faculty development program that deals not only with the internal policies of the university but also with content in the philosophy and workings of higher education. Thus, the trends and impact of promotion and tenure on universities, peer review, responsibilities of each rank, the role of the senate and board of trustees, grant writing and other peculiarities of universities become a portion of the orientation, inservice, and faculty meetings.

The junior faculty members tell me that they look at the dean's accomplishments as dazzling. As they start their teaching careers and achieve small success, the junior faculty members see the dean and full professors who have come up through the academic ranks as mentors and role models rather than as colleagues.

Colleges of nursing attract the brightest and most creative people in nursing who, because of their intellectual interests and independence, gravitate toward academia. If the college has recruited widely, the faculty will have acquired activists of various inclinations--feminists, union organizers, anarchists, advocates of special interests. In addition to the normal differences between generations, the firm ideas held by these strong people are going to cause conflict.

I believe that the vocal minority on a faculty serve the purpose of keeping people and meetings alive and moving. The dean must be certain that the movement is in the desired direction. At its best, a minority stimulates group cohesiveness for or against ideas; at its worst, it obstructs action. With support, the faculty learns effective use of peer pressure in dealing with group members who prevent achievement of goals. Whatever modicum of understanding you have of human behavior you will use in the role of dean. Your one regret will be that you did not attend fully to everything you have been exposed to, for it is too late for remedial work; you must use everything you know in the day-to-day demands of the job.

I was delighted to see that someone has done a study of the office troublemaker. An interesting finding of the study was that while troublemakers make up 10 percent of the group, they irritate 70 percent; the remaining 20 percent remain outside the fray. It is tempting to extrapolate these findings to college faculties. If you do, be aware that it is seductive for administrators to surround themselves with soothing, uncritical people. Isolation of that kind leads to the demise of leadership.

If the troublemaker only recently has captured our attention, another phenomenon that we have little scientific knowledge about is friendship. In the past few years attention has turned to the study of friendship. Within organizations, friendship patterns have not been examined carefully. A 1970 study of the career patterns of deans in nursing(8) did examine the social involvement dimension of the dean's role commitment. Factors linked were isolation, loneliness, and the tendency by the dean to compartmentalize her life or to form friends among her co-workers. The study was taken to task by an eminent dean for projecting a stereotype of the dean which was unacceptable at that time.

We need to look at friendship patterns of deans in a way that uses a more objective approach than the primitive attitudes we retain from our childhood(9). Does it make a difference to the goals of the organization if the new dean brings with her a group of friends and colleagues to build the support system of the college? What influence on decision making do faculty perceive among the "friends" of the dean? Is there a difference between a colleague and a friend, and how do you identify that difference?

The dean can renew her faith in humanity by contact with students. No student would be so brash as to consider the dean a colleague. To the undergraduate you are a role model, the key person at ceremonies, the court of the last resort, the supporter of student organizations, and the mediator for student participation in governance. You may be the very first dean the student has met.

Teaching is one way to keep you in communication with students. Very quickly you will find the course dubbed "the dean's course" and pick up on the general feeling by students that getting a poor grade from the dean is devastating to their futures. Graduate students may seek out an association with you because they have read your publication and enjoy the challenge of exchanging ideas. They want a close look at a leader and a role model.

Few faculty members perceive that the deans have a boss. In fact, you report to several people depending upon the complexity of the organization. You are a colleague of other deans in the university. Together you cooperate in formulating and implementing policies affecting colleges and in determining the goals of the university. Colleges are the center of excellence that makes up the university. Your administration of the college contributes to the balance the university wants to achieve in the use of its resources in carrying out its mission.

The dean's immediate supervisor is usually the provost or academic vice-president, the person who evaluates your performance, distributes your merit increase, and who controls your budget requests. It has been my good fortune to work with unusually competent and creative men in administration. While the pictuee may chnnge, the majority of administrators in higher education in power positions are men. Most strive to understand nursing and are pleased with the accomplishments of the college.

But the picture is not always so rosy. Changes in administrators can be unpredictable and rapid in some institutions. I have witnessed the aftermath of the abrupt resignation of a well liked university president,

the weakness of a number of acting presidents, and a chancellor who resigned in protest over a board of regents' granting tenure to a football coach. During the process of replacing an administrator in higher education, the institution comes to a halt in its planning for the future as high-level politics takes over. At least deans are in close contact with their constituents, the faculty and the students, who are the heart of the university and who continue to keep the colleges functioning under the strain.

In relating to the wider university, the dean is a link in the intricate network of committees from the colleges and the senate that contribute to the governance of the university. After all the committees have had their say and made recommendations, it is often the dean who carries out these recommendations with the affected faculty member or student. While the faculty committee disbands and a new committee is formed, the dean is left to implement the decision and easily becomes the target for procedural errors and disagreements with the committee's decision and is open to prolonged grievance procedures and litigation.

Help with knotty problems for which there are no satisfactory solutions will come from the provost's office. I have found that much thought goes into such decisions and that there is support for the dean. But occasionally what seems to you to be the just, equitable, and consistent course of action is not the one the system can tolerate. And so, there may be a day when, as part of the total enterprise of the university, you must modify your stand and accept an alternative solution.

Unions in higher education have affected the governance of universities. The philosophy of egalitarianism and the adversary relation of management versus labor in collective bargaining do not accommodate to the collegial model of governance. In many universities it is difficult to separate the identity of the faculty senate and the faculty union. Since governance of the university is not a popular activity with most faculty members, it is easy for a small majority to operate both spheres of influence, the senate and the union.

Although contracts may be confined to working conditions--salaries, workload, benefits--the traditional role of the dean as the representative of the college responsible for gaining and distributing resources is severely limited by the contract which evolves from negotiations in an adversary mode. The dean and the administrators are responsible for management--for maintaining the contract or having a grievance filed against them. The constant push is to award everyone equally rather than to permit merit increases based upon outstanding performance. The dean and administrators within the college need to keep alert to possible grievances and to deal with these situations promptly and reasonably.

To listen to a group of deans talk together, you would be convinced that academic nursing has arrived at the millennium. All of the deans have ideal faculties whose productivity is outstanding and who support for the dean is loyal and devoted. In addition, there is plenty of money and sunshine, along with brilliant students and an unswerving administration. I think this glowing attitude is based upon a belief that good deans have good faculties and good students. But it does serve as a defense to get

the dean away from her own and other people's day-to-day problems when deans meet as colleagues. As a group, deans are highly competitive over-achievers. Seeing them cooperate on a committee is a lesson in the group dynamics of leaders. In one committee I chaired, I came to the realization that deans do not expect to have their written work corrected by other deans.

Whatever aspirations for power, leadership, or work you have, you will have opportunities as a dean to meet these needs in state and national organizations and on blue-ribbon committees. Some deans get so caught up in power bases that they become cosmopolitans who only occasionally check in with a visit to the home base. But the administration and the faculty will support the dean who brings honor to the college by her national prominence.

In summary, the role of the dean is unique; the role demands vary with the needs of the college and with its different stages of development. How one enters into the role, maintains, and leaves the role emphasizes the unequal vesting of authority that occurs when the faculty accepts the dean as leader of the college. The collegial model of governance in universities is an ideal; it does not fit the reality of colleges of nursing today. Rather governance of a college of nursing is determined by the kind of faculty it has, by the support systems they are willing to create, by the structure of the organization to facilitate decision making and communication, by the management of conflict as people blend personal and professional philosophies, and by the use of resources in achieving the goals of the college, university, and profession.

The dean is a colleague of other deans. To students and junior faculty members the dean is a role model. Leadership and management are shared with mid-level administrators and senior faculty members while providing for progressively responsible participation of junior faculty and students.

The many small and discrete studies of the role of the dean in nursing need to be systematically organized into a model. But educational theorists as eminent as Griffiths(10) consider the study of the dean to be a pre-paradigm stage. And so, I believe that we need to join others in developing strategies in research which will give us greater knowledge in particular domains focused upon the dean in higher education. Significant questions have been raised in this series; members of AACN could take a leadership position in adding to the knowledge production in this role.

REFERENCES

1. Schmitz, Charles. "Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction Among Deans," UMC, 1979.

2. Evaluation of Performance of Deans, University of Delaware, mimeographed, March 10, 1975.

3. Ibid.

4. George, Shirley A. "Associate and Assistant Deanships in Schools of Nursing," Indiana University, 1979.

5. Phillips, Regina H. "Nurse Administrators' Perception of Decision Making in Collegiate Schools of Nursing," University of Pittsburgh, 1977.

6. Cleveland, Harlan. "The Education of Administrators for Higher Education." Fourth David D. Henry Lecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois, April 13-14, 1977, p. 35.

7. "Troublemakers in the Office," Time, March 17, 1980, p. 22.

8. Hall, Beverly A. et al. Dimensions of Role Commitment: Career Patterns of Deans in Nursing. Communicating Nursing Research: Is the Gap Being Bridged. Report of the Conference April 28-30, 1971. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, July 1971.

9. Griffiths, Daniel E. and McCarty, Donald J. "From Here to There." In Griffiths, D. E. and McCarty, D. J. (eds.) The Dilemma of the Deanship. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1980, p. 292.

10. Griffiths, Daniel E. and McCarty, Donald J. (eds.) The Dilemma of the Deanship. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1980.

According to Doris A. Geitgey...

I am especially pleased to have the opportunity to share with you some of my thoughts and beliefs regarding the role of the dean as a colleague. The dean, as colleague, relates to at least six different groups in the conduct of every day affairs of her office. These groups are the faculty; students; other deans, both of nursing schools and of other health sciences schools within her institution; higher administrators within the institution; nursing services administrators and personnel; and physicians, especially if the school of nursing is a component of an academic health center.

It seems important to me that we have a common understanding of what the term "colleague" means. Webster's Dictionary has defined "colleague" as "a fellow worker in the same profession; associate in office." The synonym for colleague is "associate." The term is related closely to one meaning of the word "college," defined as "an association of individuals having certain powers, rights, and duties, and engaged in some common pursuit." "Collegial" is defined as "of, or having the nature of, a college."

Since the dean of a school of nursing is involved in both education and nursing as professions, there is little difficulty in identifying the first five groups mentioned above as collegial groups. For physicians to be our colleagues, however, we must broaden the meaning of the word "profession" beyond "nursing" and "medicine" to "health professions." "Collegial relationships" and "colleague" are used currently in this expanded sense.

It is interesting to note that the term "colleague" does not imply "equal," except as may be inferred from the definition of "college." Such an inference may or may not be well-founded, depending upon the situation.

The concept of the collegial relationship seems to me a very positive and important one. It serves as the basis for my approach to functioning as the dean of the University of Kansas School of Nursing. It is the very essence of participative management and is reflected in the maintenance of an "open door" policy.

The effective collegial relationship is founded on mutual understanding, respect, and trust. It signifies that two (or more) heads are better than one in the solution of problems or in determining future goals. It provides the sense of belonging that Maslow identified as a need of all people. It requires the identification of a common purpose or raison d'être.

Doris A. Geitgey, R.N., Ed.D., is dean, School of Nursing, University of Kansas, Kansas City, Kansas.

The dean who functions as a colleague must recognize that the establishment of such a modus operandi takes time. If mutual understanding, respect, and trust are the bases of the relationships, one must recognize that time is required to build those bases. I can assure you that there is likely to be much testing of whether or not you "really do operate" in this way; whether or not you "really mean what you say"; whether or not your actions are congruent with what you say--actions do speak louder than words.

In addition to the time required, the establishment of a sound collegial relationship requires a free flow of communications in both directions. The lines of communication will depend largely on the type and size of school of nursing of which you are the dean. Let me say, however, that the open door reflects the readiness and willingness to maintain open communications. I personally enjoy, and therefore prefer, face-to-face communication in as many situations as possible. To date, however, I have not been able to clone myself so that I can be present in three or more places at once.

If mutual understanding, respect, and trust are basic to a collegial relationship, the dean must have a large measure of self-understanding and self-respect. If I do not respect myself, how can I have respect for others, or others for me? If I do not trust myself sufficiently, how can I promote open communications and practice the open door policy? Such behaviors could be very threatening without at least a modicum of self-trust and self-respect. Self-understanding and self-respect permit the dean to be flexible in behaviors and able to accept alternative solutions or actions without being psychologically damaged or destroyed. These values provide the strength to give credit to the person to whom it is due and thus enhance the collegial relationship. They also give courage to accept the responsibilities and challenges of "deaning," without the necessity of developing an ulcer.

THE COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH FACULTY

It is my belief that the most important colleagues of a dean are the faculty members, for they are the heart and soul of any educational program. They are the determinants of the quality of the program, and they have the informal power to make or break the dean, especially as a leader. After all, what is a leader without followers?

How does a dean work as a colleague with faculty members? I believe that there are some basic principles that apply, and that can be elucidated through examples.

The first principle is to develop open communications. When I became dean at the University of Kansas in April 1975, there were 32 faculty members, and face-to-face communication was relatively easy. Now there are nearly 100 faculty members, and the communication network is at a different level and on a different scale. Nevertheless, I try very hard to keep communication open. To do this, we have established five departments within the school; consequently, I deal primarily with department

chairmen who, in turn, have face-to-face discussions with smaller groups of faculty members. In this way, all faculty members can and do have input into the functioning of the school. Department chairpersons, deans, and directors make up the Executive Committee of the school. We meet twice a month to discuss administrative problems and to share any information that we have about the College of Health Sciences and the university. This group works with me on budgets, on selecting individuals to represent the school at various meetings, and on identifying faculty members for cross-departmental courses.

An example of the functioning of this committee was the recent discussion of the desirability of an Office of Nursing Grants and Research. I felt a real need for such a facilitating office, but some of the department chairpersons believed that all faculty positions should be used for teaching. After about two hours of very active debate, the decision was reached that the department chairpersons would discuss the issue with their faculties, and the recommendations would be made to me at the next Executive Committee meeting. This was done, and the recommendations were that I present the rationale for the office to the faculty at a meeting and through a written memo. The first action was taken at our first convocation, and the second one week later. The Office of Nursing Grants and Research is now an accomplished fact. Incidentally, the faculty has responded very favorably, both to the office and to having an annual fall convocation.

In addition to the departmental route to open communications, we have total faculty meetings monthly. These meetings are planned and conducted by the Faculty Steering Committee, rather than by the dean. One member of the Executive Committee serves on the Faculty Steering Committee as a liaison person. This change was instituted in 1978 at my request and, obviously, with my total support. At these meetings I am provided some time to present information to the faculty as a whole, but more importantly, I have the opportunity to hear their concerns and problems first hand. The Graduate Education Committee and the Undergraduate Education Committee also hold monthly meetings devoted to their specific endeavors, and I attend these meetings as frequently as possible.

The open door policy which I follow also facilitates free communication. When faculty members really want to talk with me about something specific, they usually make appointments. When my door is open, however, they frequently drop in to say "hello" and perhaps have a cup of coffee. During these times we may just chat for a short time, and usually the talk is about student achievements, faculty achievements, or how the clinical instruction is going. Regardless of the topic of discussion, I believe it is important, and I find it rewarding, that the faculty feel comfortable in being able to have this kind of communication. The opportunities for it are especially evident when the faculty member is using the copier and on pay day.

A second principle of administration I follow is to give credit to whom it is due. When I hear a good report about an instructor from a student or anyone else, I make the effort to let the instructor know about

it. I believe this is especially important feedback for new faculty members. When grants are written and funded, when books or articles are published, when awards of one kind or another are earned by faculty, or when doctoral degrees are completed, recognition is given through personal contact and a posted notice or announcement. Flowers are sent on especially auspicious occasions. These behaviors stem from my previous experiences as a faculty member. One dean for whom I worked allowed no grant proposal to be submitted without listing her as principal investigator. Another dean took full credit for all achievements of the school, without any recognition of the faculty effort. I must say I learned from these experiences. I respect the faculty who work with me and recognize that without them there would be no educational program.

A third principle of functioning as a colleague is mutual respect for the territorial imperatives of each other. The faculty handbook of the University of Kansas clearly states that the faculty is responsible for the curriculum and for student selection, retention, and promotion. Although I feel free to give input into these matters, the final decision is made by the faculty or its designated committees. I expect, and receive, similar consideration in relation to the administrative decisions regarding budget, faculty assignment to departments, and similar issues. The faculty are free to provide input, but they recognize that the final decisions are my prerogative.

Other efforts I make as a colleague are to try to respond as positively as possible to faculty requests, for example, editing a publication prior to submission or varying vacation days from routine periods, and to provide social activities to avoid the "all work and no play" syndrome. To this end, and to thank the faculty and staff, each year during the holiday season I give a dinner in my home. (Imagine the decible level of nearly a hundred people all talking at once!)

Recognition of and respect for the rights, abilities, and achievements of the faculty and their reciprocal recognition and respect for me have led to a climate of mutual understanding, respect, and trust. This makes for a warm, relatively serene work environment for all of us, working as colleagues.

THE COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS

Establishing a collegial relationship with students can be accomplished by using the same principles discussed earlier. In general, such a relationship will not be as long-lasting as with faculty, and probably not as individualized. It is difficult to develop individual relationships with each student in a large school of nursing. For this reason, I usually work with students in groups or individually with student leaders.

The common purpose that underlies the collegial relationship with students is to provide excellent patient care in the future. This purpose is our focus in providing the best learning opportunities possible in our particular situation. Role-modeling by the faculty and dean is an important method of providing such opportunities.

Open communications are made possible through student-faculty forums which are held at least two times a year, and more often on student or faculty request. We have orientation sessions with the undergraduate and graduate students during registration week. In these sessions, I encourage the students to become involved actively in school governance through membership on school committees. I inform them of my use of the open door policy and welcome them to come in and talk with me. (Many do.) Convocation gives students and faculty the opportunity to see each other, to hear about the current status and goals of the school, and to start becoming acquainted with each other. Simple things, such as saying "hi" or "how goes it?" in the hallways help maintain friendly, collegial relations with students.

Mutual understanding, respect, and trust are just as important in working with students as with faculty. I firmly believe that we cannot expect our students to develop these values in caring for patients/clients unless we treat students on the same basis. Again, it is perhaps not possible for the dean to deal with each student, but the atmosphere can be demonstrated and exemplified by the dean with groups of students and in working with student leaders. I hold our students in high regard, and I let them know I do.

COLLEGIAL RELATIONS WITH OTHERS

Collegial relationships with other deans, with higher level administrators, with nursing service personnel, and with physicians are based on the same principles that have been enunciated above. In each instance the first requirement is to recognize the "rights, powers, and duties" of the group involved, and to determine "the common pursuit" in which we are engaged.

In my situation, the deans of the College of Health Sciences meet weekly to discuss new faculty appointments and common problems and concerns. These meetings provide opportunities for continuing communications, and we all learn a great deal from each other. Participatory management requires true commitment to the goals of the institution and to the process itself. This is true for the follower as well as for the leader. As the deans meet together, I see solid evidence of mutual understanding, respect, and trust developing. I find it refreshing to hear my non-nurse colleagues holding up the School of Nursing as having the best governance and morale of any of the schools in the College of Health Sciences.

In working with deans of other schools of nursing, I try to participate actively in AACN, in the deans' organization in Kansas, in the organization called Collegiate Nurse Educators of Greater Kansas City, and in the Midwest Alliance in Nursing. In each instance, I attempt to follow the principles underlying collegial relationships.

In dealing with higher-level administrators I try to communicate openly and with respect for their wisdom and abilities. I have sufficient self-respect and courage that I not only accept negative comments but also give them when indicated. I try to do this, not in anger, but on the

basis of fact or best current information. I try to focus on the purpose of the institution and to give positive strokes as frequently as possible.

The relationships with nursing service personnel of the hospital are quite good. I have frequent meetings with the director, who also holds a faculty appointment in the School of Nursing. We both serve as co-chairpersons of the committee on nursing in the college and hospital. Incidentally, there are physicians on the committee also, and they are emphatic in their comments on the good relationship and how much they have learned about nursing and nursing education through the committee's activities. Knowledge of and respect for each other's purpose, functions, abilities, and concerns have provided a firm foundation for the development of collegial relationships. Faculty members are active in providing in-service education for nursing services, and clinical specialists in nursing services serve as preceptors and lecturers for the School of Nursing. This reciprocal relationship is very effective in supporting the collegial endeavors of the director and the dean.

The principles underlying collegial relations with physicians are essentially the same as used with other groups: an identified common purpose, mutual understanding, respect and trust, and honest, open communications. Time for development of these values is essential to sound relationships. In four years of joint effort with an orthopedist I found that a fine professional relationship could be developed with effort and good will on the part of both parties. Such effort really paid off in the improvement of patient care and a sound colleague/associate relationship.

As you may guess, administering a School of Nursing through the collegial approach is not always sweetness and light. How does one cope with an authoritarian person, or one who is so enamored of participative management that she or he attempts to make decisions behind the scenes or through an "end run" around the dean? What about the faculty person who is less than committed to the school?

I believe that open communication, emphasizing the positive aspects, clearly defining the problem aspects, sensitivity to needs, firmness, and integrity are the keys to coping with such issues. It may be necessary to delay one's own self-gratification in some instances; that is to say, let the fire of the moment die out before attacking the problem--in other words, "cool it"!

I must confirm that establishing and working through collegial relationships does not free the dean from final responsibility for the administration of a School of Nursing. Delegated responsibility cannot be delegated to others--Delegatus non potest delegare. You as a dean are accountable for the school, but well founded, reciprocal relationships with our colleagues really make "deaning" more effective, satisfying, and enjoyable.

At this time I would like to share with you two pieces of philosophy that have guided my life. The first is from Hamlet (Act I, Scene 3, Line 78): "This above all--to thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." And the other one is from Thanatopsis by William Cullen Bryant: "So live, that

when thy summons comes to join the innumerable caravan, which moves to that mysterious realm, where each shall take his chamber in the silent halls of death, thou go, not like the quarry slave at night, scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave, like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

According to Virginia R. Jarratt. . .

If one wishes to venture into the disconcerting examination and rediscovery of words and meanings, one has only to agree by telephone to develop a paper on a theme that is deceptively familiar. And a deceptive familiarity cloaks all of our terminology in this time of imprecise rhetoric and immediacy of need to capsule communication. What I would have expounded on spontaneously upon acceptance would have been presented from a somewhat different and more global perspective than the one which, after rethinking and re-examining the colleague role or roles of the dean, I have now. I have come to the wiser, more complex, more intriguing, more challenging view that there is no one colleague role; there are segments, and there are different role sectors and expectations which must somehow be congruent and harmonious with the administrative process. I am convinced that positive human relationships and interaction are the modifiers that give dimension to any use of the word "colleague."

Since the 1960s the words "collegial relationships" have been often used and misused, particularly in devising or aspiring to different university governance structures. Although I cannot find the source, I do remember that the word collegial was originally derived from the College of Cardinals, meaning similar rank and similar authority relationships. The noun "colleague" is defined as "an associate or co-worker, typically in a professional or civil or ecclesiastical office, and often of similar rank." The verb "colleague" means "to bind together, become allied with, enter into an alliance, cooperate, conspire, to colleague with."

In contemplating the many meanings of colleague relationships ascribed to the dean's role, I have to consider both the noun and the verb. One is a formal denotation; the other represents the intricate active process of colleaguing that is continuous, complex, often ambiguous, but, if successful, always rewarding. I agree wholeheartedly with Doris Geitgey that the effective collegial relationship is founded upon mutual understanding, respect, and trust. To establish and maintain those essential foundations, however, demand unusual perception, alertness, and responsiveness. There is a continuum for goal recognition and goal conceptualization within groups. Some are at one end and some are at another. A dean has to intereact with persons at different points in different ways. The further along toward the end of mutual goal conceptualization the actors are, the closer the colleague relationship can be.

Variables change almost constantly. The university, and academic units within the university, are shifting scenes. Wish it so as we may, the arena is not comprised of solid ground, nor is it likely to be.

Virginia R. Jarratt, R. N., Ph.D., is dean, College of Nursing, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Administrators change; faculty members come and go; new generations of students come with different characteristics and perspectives; funding sources and external controls and influences rise and fall. The collegial interchanges and experiences are affected by a multitude of variables. A dean must manage to identify the variables and develop strategies to keep in touch with changes and the impact of those changes. To keep one's sights clear and at least one foot out of the quicksand, the dean must somehow balance segmental relationships while keeping goals clear, confidence refueled, and both his or her personal and administrative identities--hence he or she must reflect the word colleague as a noun and a verb.

The dean must hold his or her own, his or her rights of negotiation with those of equal or higher rank, while binding together and colleaguing with all of the constituents who are of, and necessary to, the college--students, faculty, the nursing community, other health professionals, the public, the legislators.

In my philosophy, the conduct of administration is like putting deposits of trust in a human bank account. An administrator may overdraw occasionally by the nature of decision required and actions needed that cannot be fully explained, but he had better be sure that he keeps enough trust in the account to cover the short-fall emergencies.

This paper focuses on the dean as a colleague with specific groups involved in administrative relationships. One must be in colleague with all of these, yet, in particular situations, hold only a segment of colleagueship with each. Fine lines and differences in territory and primary goals are implied, and I believe these distinctions important. A stable, universal colleague role with all is rare. The role is sometimes formal, sometimes informal, sometimes situational. All of the relationships are extremely important.

ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Central administrative officers, other deans, associate deans, interdisciplinary peers, and others make up a significant constellation of relationships essential to the operation of a college. All of these are colleagues in administration of the total enterprise; all are associated by nature of formal position and engagement in total institutional concerns. Deans of educational programs in nursing achieve true colleagueship with their counterparts by successfully blending universal concerns with particular college or discipline concerns. It is not an easy path, but traveling it has given me some of my greatest enjoyments, my greatest challenges, and has provided roots for some of the greater accomplishments. It has also provided some skinned knees when I walked the path carelessly. In those cases, one can only brush off the "skinning," pay little attention to the "smarting," and get back up on the path. Preoccupation with the wounds of stumbling is not a luxury given to an administrator and could lead one to travel a separate path while the rest move on.

No dean can serve his/her college well unless he/she establishes its credibility as an integral component of the institution. That means assuring that he/she knows enough about other academic units and is informed enough about higher education, that all interchange is not based upon one predictable narrow stance and viewpoint. Credibility is earned, not given on demand, and it starts with confidence and a clear philosophy of nursing education's rights, privileges, and obligations for full membership in the academic community. If one wishes to hold equal status, one does not yell and ask for quarter or "King's X" in negotiations about faculty roles and qualifications, expectations of students, and academic or nonacademic prerogatives. One must explicate rationale, justify differences within and among academic units on a basis other than "we are different." Our difference, handled wisely, is one that even needs accolade at times, not apology.

Credibility involves willingness to stick one's neck out to uphold principles of higher education and the ability to take an unbiased look at the merit of proposals and ideas over territorial rights. More is gained by credible discourse than by fighting every time the bell rings. Central administrative officers and other deans are colleagues, and they do want the good that comes to a university through all units' gaining praiseworthy visibility. I can't stress enough the value of recognizing both internal and external factors that may create pressure or infringe upon autonomy and of preparing a plan or alternative before one is suggested to you. This need for alertness is one of the major reasons that a dean must keep in touch with what is happening nationally, with changes in political climate, and with signs of discontent. The rumblings cannot be ignored if one wishes to avoid a constant pattern of reacting. When one is backed against the wall, options are few. For example, we should have all predicted the growing lobbying to create a "two-two" system for baccalaureate education, with the ultimate demise of generic programs. The proposals hit at what is popular now--the greatest number at the lowest cost. We need our administrative colleagues as true allies in validating the need for higher education in nursing. If we remain on the fringe, unable to reach full partnership, we become the fringe cut first in retrenchment and program evaluation.

FACULTY AS COLLEAGUES

I believe it a reality to say that faculty, collectively, are colleagues in some things always, in some things sometimes, in total concert seldom--but always of primary importance. The make-up of the collective may vary and, at the least, keeps a dean from falling into comfortable but illusive sterotyping of group alliances.

A dean must establish colleagueship with faculty for program goals, productivity, and accomplishment of mission within the university, or something will have to give. If both are not in colleague on major goals, and differences are extreme, devising strategies for resolution becomes a first priority, and should be tried before division into disparate camps occurs. Free and open communication is best as a preventive measure and

absolutely crucial as a curative or restorative measure. But communication is not enough. There are territories that overlap and gray areas in prerogatives. In both situations, boundary lines depend upon the characteristics of the dean and the characteristics of the faculty. If a dean delegates, he/she cannot deal directly with everyone. Departmentalization, with layered responsibilities and functions, makes much of the indirect communication. The potential for misquotes of "the dean says" is phenomenal. I believe it essential for a dean to try to create and to take advantage of opportunities to relate with faculty spontaneously, informally, and as a colleague in a personal role as well as a professional role. Where there are program divisions headed by directors or associate and assistant deans, the close colleague relationship occurs with those persons in the regular meetings and through frequent interchange.

Being a colleague with all faculty cannot occur by self-designation. One must be accepted as a colleague before he or she can enact the role. This is why I believe the role is segmental, that is, in segments of our work together, I can view and be viewed as colleague. In my formal role, with its perceived power (mythological as it may be), I am not viewed as colleague by all. I have found that no matter how equal I view my relationship with faculty in informal, spontaneous discussions about topics such as curriculum and work load, what is said is always colored by how different faculty members perceive or have hang ups about authority and how they can allow a dean to display different roles or opinions. I enjoy honing my wits in debate, being the devil's advocate, entering wholeheartedly in discussion with the same freedom tnat I had as a faculty member. Too often for comfort I have found that such shifting in role is not easy. Regardless of how I view my peer role in such instances, the statements may take on meaning and implications not intended and not realized. Colleagueship does not imply constant agreement. It implies freedom to debate. Such debate can occur only in an environment of trust and mutual acceptance of the right to disagree and the confidence and stamina to perservere if the proposals deserve consideration.

Neither effective leadership nor effective administration can flourish in a climate of distrust or fear of reprisal. While I am amazed that I can be perceived as a threat because of position power, I do know that this probability exists in every setting for every dean. Constant clarification of faculty and administrative prerogatives is advisable if not essential. The fewer the games played, the truer the colleague label. Each needs to know where the other stands when plans are stated and proposals are made. The dean's desire to be a colleague faculty member and his/her responsibility to judge as an administrator what can and should be shared and what cannot are in frequent conflict. Some information is privileged and cannot be shared if one is to protect the right of privacy of others.

Having moved recently to a new college, a new group, a new setting, I am still picking my way toward achieving mutual understanding of both the noun colleague and the verb colleague. As the faculty and I test one another, I find myself missing the easy, open discussions, and even the confrontations. I hope to prove that differences are O.K. I believe that

true academic debate can occur only with full granting and acceptance of the right to differ rationally. One of the worst things a dean could do, in my opinion, is to want everyone to think and act alike. If a program is to thrive, one must cultivate differences, seek to hear different sides. Only then can the dean have freedom in the faculty role and in retaining the right of individual debate. Only then can conflicts and dissatisfactions move from destructive backstage sideshows to frontstage full rehearsal and production and changes in acts.

The nature of the position and the limits of perceived or real authority result in some casting of a dean in an adversary role, whether it is a true role typing or not. Even recognizing this phenomenon, I have been suprised and enlightened to find that I am often cast in a supportive role to faculty when other faculty are, in reality, in adversary roles to each other. This has been particularly apt to occur in tenure, promotion, and merit reviews. In such cases, peer reaction to faculty rights of disagreement and debate has sometimes been authoritarian and restrictive, and I find that I have switched to faculty advocate rather than threat to faculty. More and more I am less inclined to succumb to the magical enticement that there is automatic purity in peer review or automatic purity in group action. Both groups and individuals can be autocratic. The dean should have comfort and assurance in fostering fair colleague relationships whether it be dean-faculty or faculty-faculty.

Faculty members are the core of the educational program. They make the success of the college, if it occurs. The value of faculty morale, accomplishment, and professional and personal development cannot be overestimated. I believe that a dean must be in colleague with individual research efforts, faculty development, and promotion of effective teaching strategies. Some of the more exciting aspects of the dean's colleague relationship with faculty members are hearing and reacting to the ideas and plans for research and encouraging and even reading and reacting to articles written, books planned, projects envisioned. This uniting in academic pursuits is part of a true colleague role.

The dean is also in a natural and potentially strong colleague relationship with faculty in attending to professional concerns; political activities; and relationships with the nursing and medical community, health agencies, and the public. In those endeavors, both dean and faculty work as peers, undisturbed and unhampered by superior-subordinate relationships or concerns.

The faculty holds primary responsibility for curriculum. The dean, as both a faculty member and an administrator, gives input but cannot coerce. The same is true for faculty consultation and suggestion in administrative decisions. Where curriculum matters require change in budget, remarkable change in faculty complement, or student enrollments, the dean must provide the facts, discuss the parameters of decision possible, and ask for alternatives throughout the process. Most importantly, curriculum decisions must be a total faculty product, not based on the biases of a few. A dean works in colleague with faculty for all faculty interests, and must take care that actions and the voices of small influential groups are not mistaken for consensus.

A word more about curriculum. I have not yet seen clear analysis of the dean's role in curriculum construction, revision, implementation, and evaluation. While there is no question of the responsibility that faculty hold, I insist that the dean cannot abdicate responsibility with that precise a division. Extent of need for involvement depends upon knowledge, experience, and sophistication of faculty. A new program may need significant involvement of the dean. With the shift to clinical specialization in graduate programs and decrease in functional options or combinations, more and more faculty are remarkably naive or unprepared in curriculum matters and learning theories. A dean must assure that institutional policies prevail, prevent abuse of the credit hour, and be aware of the increasing contractual and legal nature of written course requirements. I believe that tinkering with curriculum occurs by faculty in all programs and that some sabotage is a very real possibility in all groups. At the least, a dean must have keen analytical awareness of such processes.

Faculty members come with specific ideas, some particular biases for content, some very sincere commitments for change. Perhaps only in a utopian existence is there absence of stereotyping persons by the nature of the specialty chosen and viewing curriculum territory accordingly. That the faculty has responsibility for curriculum does not mean that the dean sits through all talk of options and proposals like a sphinx.

A faculty member in a college of arts and sciences once shared an interesting insight with me: "Your college has a strength in curriculum planning. In other disciplines, the faculty determine the curriculum. If we get a person strong in European history, for example, focus in the major changes. In nursing, the curriculum determines the faculty sought and recruited." That poses some difference in course accountability.

Budgeting is more and more on a programmatic basis. A dean has to be involved in program goals and long-range planning and has to be able to support and explain changes to a multitude of publics. Some programs lose support, have external interference, or lose viability because that necessary interchange, mutual responsibility, and examination of consequences is not engaged in by both dean and faculty. A dean in nursing education is chairman of a discipline and dean of a college. He or she shares curriculum decision accountability with faculty. The higher the level of colleagueship, the more congruent the academic and professional goals, the less the dean may be involved and the less the potential scapegoating. Provision of leadership in facilitating quality of program, teaching effectiveness, and research is a legitimate function of the deanship.

On the personal side, the dean's colleague relationship with faculty is the most difficult, the most complex, the most rewarding, and sometimes the most frustrating of all roles. I could not bear a situation in which many colleague relationships with faculty did not exist. Trying to keep the process going is one of the heaviest drains on energy and psyche, but that academic partnership is the key to quality of program and quality of job satisfaction.

COLLEAGUE RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS

The factors influencing collegial relationships with students are similar to those previously discussed in the colleague relationship. Openness, respect, mutuality of goals, and trust are as essential with students as with the other groups. Unless a dean carries a teaching assignment, contact is less frequent, less continuous, and less a core of the relationship constellation. Nevertheless, some of my most enjoyable and worthwhile colleague relationships have been with students. They have taught me much about "deaning," have helped me keep the larger goals clear, have let me share excitement about what is to be learned, how it is to be learned, and kept me alert to consumer needs. They have reinforced my belief that the teacher-learner reaction is a reversible equation. Students are our consumers. Their performance as graduates has vital effect upon our goals, operation, and future. I suspect that their perceptiveness and influence is too often underestimated.

It may be my own need that makes me value student contacts and interaction, but I believe strongly that administrators, faculty, and students are linked necessarily in the educational enterprise, and students have legitimate rights of participation, evaluation, and consultation concerning matters that affect them. If this be true, the dean must make sure that the governance structure allows student input.

Frequently, deans tend to see only the student leaders or the students in difficulty and may miss the "norms" of each group. I have deliberately kept an assignment of students for academic advising so that I can establish a relationship over time with some. I truly function as a colleague in the verb meaning in the process. We colleague in the learning and educational problems, and I have experienced what I consider some true peer interchange on a range of subjects. Strange to say, I have found some students much more freely assertive and readily frank in disagreement than some faculty are. I have learned much about nursing education from their point of view--some of it exhilarating, some of it embarrassing. They psych us very well and are amazingly charitable.

A caution--a dean's interest in and enjoyment of relationships with students can be misinterpreted by faculty members who are insecure. A dean must assure by actions and behavior that he/she is not seeking criticisms of faculty, that he/she is not infringing upon faculty territory, and that he/she will handle complaints only if the faculty member also is included. By the same token, a student deserves the opportunity to be heard. Trust has to occur on both sides--that you will not divulge student comments without his permission and that you will not undermine faculty by encouraging inappropriate detours in resolution of problems.

Attempting to keep a finger on the pulse of the student body is time-consuming. With the press of priorities in administration, that use of time might well be questioned. I value the relationships, however, and am willing to expend the energy. In both formal and informal contact, the dean can get invaluable cues about program enactment, understanding of college philosophy, and the nature of the student concerns. Perhaps I

have substituted students for the one-to-one treasured relationships with patients. If clients are to be considered and heard as individuals, and if they are to participate in decisions about their care, the analogy should be valid as well for students who are our educational clients.

OTHER COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIPS

One important requirement for a dean is to strive for a bridge of understanding between the primary world of education and the world of practice and the public. Those worlds must be linked, and I consider this an important part of the dean's role, not only to build relationships but also to identify and share both broad and local issues with the faculty.

Colleague relationships with other deans of nursing schools across the country, through organizational activities and alliances, are extremely valuable. With those colleagues, one can share problems, identify common goals, let one's hair down with consultative questions and answers.

Finally, our support for programs, ultimately our success, depends upon the quality of our colleaguing with and communicating our mission, goals, undertakings, and plans to the academic community, other health professions, and the public.

I must end this attempt to examine the dean as colleague with reaffirmation that affective colleagueship is not a chameleon relationship nor a manipulative one. It is impossible without valuing self as well as others. It is the freedom to be and to let be, to foster the most of what each can become for some common reason.

As my friends well know, I refer often to lines on the opening page of the little book, "I Seem to Be a Verb." They seem appropriate for summarizing the multiple roles as dean.

> I live on Earth at present
> and I don't know what I am.
> I know that I am not a category.
> I am not a thing--a noun.
> I seem to be a verb,
> An evolutionary process--
> an integral function of the Universe.

I don't want to be a noun, a category, a generalized person, or dean. I want to be that which denotes effective, humanistic action, not an object, but a transitive verb that requires an object for meaning--a verb affecting the universe and affected by the universe, but not merely a thing or position existing in the universe. It means that I must also change if the evolutionary process is to occur. Colleagueship, in the best sense, insures that change and process.

According to Georgie C. Labadie...

I consider it an honor to be a speaker at this workshop, and to address you, my colleagues, on the topic, "The Dean as Colleague." I must confess, however, that I was neither born with administrative talents to be nurtured nor bred for the role of educational administrator. Like you, I was drawn from the ranks of teachers, and so I practice deaning with a certain amount of ambivalence. For, while I have not totally abandoned the classroom, I have in some respects moved away from the interpersonal and intellectual camaraderie inherent in faculty status.

My view of the dean as colleague has derived from three perspectives. One perspective is based on several years as a faculty member relating to and with deans. One perspective is based on a distillation of less than two years' experience in university administration, which I view as the art of relating to and with people in as fair a manner as possible. The third perspective is drawn from selected literature on higher education generally and on nursing education and its administration in particular.

I would like to have you look with me at the setting within which deaning occurs, at the participants in the collegial process, and finally, at the strategies and skills needed to function effectively within the organization and the process.

THE SETTING

What I shall say about the setting for deaning will be brief. Much has been written about the organizational structure of higher education and the place of nursing within that structure. A new dean would do well to find out as much as possible about the setting in which he or she is prepared to provide leadership. Knowledge of its history, something of its values and traditions, and the patterns of relationships as perceived by those who have worked in the setting is necessary to one's exploration of the possibilities for employment in the deaning arena. As a faculty member I worked in public and private institutions and in hierarchical and flat academic organizations. The faculty member who aspires to be a dean would do well to analyze the interactions taking place within the organization about which she is most familiar, the institution where he or she currently holds a faculty appointment. The setting in which deaning takes place can be more carefully studied when one is not caught up in and when one's reactions are not colored by the daily activities of the dean's position. The effects of the nature and type of setting on communication

---

Georgie C. Labadie, R.N., Ed.D., is dean, School of Nursing, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida.

and interpersonal relations can perhaps better be assessed from the viewpoint of faculty in preparation for the transition to the role of dean.

Please recognize that the physical as well as the human setting must be considered in focusing on the relationships between dean and all other constituent groups in the academic sphere.

THE PARTICIPANTS

The dean is a colleague in at least four camps, and in a sense she is truly multicultural. The dean must be comfortable in the four neighboring cultures, accepting of and accepted by all four, and able to work within and between the four groups. These four groups--students, faculty, other deans, and administrators--have unique characteristics as groups which make the dean's days interesting, stimulating, rewarding, and frustrating.

Students

Students' interests in voice and vote will rise and fall depending on the issues. One measure of student interest is their involvement in voice and vote on purely student issues. Beyond that point, sustained student interest seems to diminish. Usually the same students are involved in all of the issues. While all students should be the targets of communication aimed at informing, this core group represents those with whom the dean can most successfully establish channels for consultation and decision-making. Undergraduate students vary in the extent to which they are able to and are provided with opportunities to participate formally in decision-making. Graduate students, on the other hand, with a range of abilities, experiences, and interests, coupled with flexible schedules, tend to participate more actively and, furthermore, to seek out opportunities to influence the educational processes in which they are involved.

Students have changed over the years. It might interest you to know that the first organized student protest movement in this country occurred at my institution in the 1950s. My institution, as well as all other institutions in the country, have gone through and grown through many a turmoil since that time. The issues have varied, as have the institutional responses to students' unrest. Students were awake and alert during the 1960s; they were relatively quiet and subdued during the 1970s. There are signs that they are waking up again to meet the 1980s head on. Have we learned from the past? Can we cope with the 1980s? Only time will tell. The Foote Commission at Berkeley pinpointed two failures of that institution in relation to its students:

- "Failure to develop a student body that respects the value of the intellect itself..."
- "Failure to order its activities according to a conscious conception of its unique purpose of nurturing that intellect"(1).

Can we be sure that at Berkeley and at our own institutions attention has been given to eliminating these failures or at least to diminishing the impact of these failures on our students? Have we sufficiently tapped our student resources to assure their active involvement in decision-making? I submit that student motivation to participate more actively can be stimulated by a dean who seeks out student involvement and by a faculty that genuinely believes that teaching/learning is an interactive process.

The Faculty

The outdated notion of university governance based on collegial action and authority held the view that the faculty represented a self-governing community of leaders. This view of governance was differentiated from that invested in boards of trustees which represented the "public trust" and that invested in administrative officers who represented "bureaucratic authority." The idea that the faculty could and would govern itself was quickly displaced by a faculty that showed more interest in teaching or research than in university governance.

Faculty interest and involvement in university governance is inextricably related to setting; frequently, therefore, to know the type of setting (private versus public, teachers colleges versus research institutions, sectarian versus secular) is to know the faculty and what it is about. The extent to which faculty members become involved will depend by and large on the faculty.

Faculty have always participated actively in decision-making at all levels in colleges and universities. However, the single most important barrier to effective participation in governance has been the tendency to look at governance issues, not in terms of the total institutional impact, but primarily in one or another of its aspects. For example, issues related to academic programming, admissions, program expansion, or retrenchment rarely are discussed in relation to the impact on financial decisions. In fact, in many instances, financial decisions and academic decisions are made in separate quarters and are meshed "after the fact." As institutions have grown and become parts of systems, the decisions are made further away from the arena in which their greatest impact will be felt. In systems such as the one with which I am most familiar, many decisions are made in areas external to the institution, and while there are opportunities to influence the direction of the decision, time barriers are such that full participation by most groups within the institution is severely hampered.

It has been observed that faculty may have abdicated some responsibility for decision-making, particularly in relation to those matters such as tenure, promotion, and salary, which are of direct concern to the faculty. As unionism has increased throughout the academic world, faculties have conceded to external agencies the right to determine their own colleagueship. The process which the faculty endorses by choosing a union is inimical to the continuation of the mixed roles of professor-administrator.

What this means is that some areas for decision-making are closed to active participation on the part of faculty. This means, further, that the dean is in a critical position to provide an atmosphere within which faculty members can feel as much a part of the process as possible. I would encourage each of you to read widely, particularly the literature of the past decade, about the changes in faculty attitudes, roles, and responsibilities that have been brought about at least partially by the period of student unrest. Read also about the changes in the profession and the professoriate brought about by the rise of unionism. Without a historical perspective on where and what the faculty has been, an appreciation for the current and future status of the faculty is based on unreal rather than real circumstances.

The interface between dean and faculty is critical and becomes highly complex in large educational systems. The problems of management come to fore when the dean assumes that the faculty knows what is to be done, why, how, and by whom. The dean must recognize that the key to successful deaning is leadership ability, getting work done through and by others. I am told by other deans and by some faculty members, that people (insert faculty members if you will) need to be, indeed, want to be led. The dean who can communicate clearly what is to be done, why, how, and by whom, has mastered the key to successful deaning--that is, if all agree with the pronouncements and the means defined within the organization for controlling. I would suggest that a new dean has more problems, real or imagined, with these two areas, leading and controlling, than with any of the other areas associated with the management of an educational unit in nursing. Why?

A self-assessment of oneself as a faculty member provides some clues. How the dean communicates the what, why, how, and by whom is important. Does she do this in a memorandum? Does she provide a written assignment of responsibility? Does she provide for individual discussion and compromise, if warranted? This initial introduction to the academic setting for new faculty members, and new deans for that matter, will help to color expectations one holds as dean. Answers to questions such as "Does the assignment change each term, or each year?" can easily be anticipated on the basis of past experiences of faculty with deans. Are differences in assignments based on rank or tenure or preparation or reputation? Should they be? In his discussion of quality versus equality as the dilemma of the university, Boulding(2) identified the faculty as comprising two groups, the "cosmos" and the "locals." The "cosmos" were described as the ones who were visible in the labor market, especially through publications and activities, such as delivering or going to hear speeches, outside the university. The "locals" were described as those who stayed home to do the donkey work of the university, such as teaching and participating in governance. Are assignments based on the "cosmos" versus the "locals" positions in the unit in nursing? Should they be? Who shall decide?

Clear guidelines developed by the faculty can assist the dean in making some decisions, particularly personnel decisions. But, of course,

you all have learned that we deans reserve the right to make some decisions, regardless.

A second problem area for the dean lies in the controlling function, defined by Longest(3) as measuring and correcting the activities of people and things in an organization to assure that goals are attained. In relation to students, the faculty have that responsibility and authority, and you all know the terrible pain and distress that causes, particularly with negative decisions. The dean is no less bothered by the necessity of having faculty suffer negative consequences for actions perceived to be in contradiction to institutional goals and objectives. The criteria by which rewards and punishments are meted out, the mechanisms available for communicating them, are all part of the armamentarium of the dean. When she chooses the time, the place, and the means, she must take into consideration the setting, the people, and the processes involved; she must also carry out her task with the full knowledge of the possible range of consequences, good and not so good. Measuring and rewarding become problematic when rewards are few and priorities must be established. Measuring and correcting, where possible, become problematic when the dean's view of a situation is not equally shared by those being corrected.

In either situation, leading or controlling, the dean's interpersonal skills will be tested to the limit, and if she has done a self-assessment of her skills, consciously developed them, minimized her weaknesses, and is well aware of her strengths, she will have a more positive outcome in all of her dealings with the faculty, who may or not be as skillful as she.

Deans

There is a saying that deans are a dime a dozen. Why anyone would want to be one is a mystery. But here we are, those of us who are deans and those of you who want to be. What of your place in academe? The dean, as we know her, is a relative newcomer to the scene and, therefore, is in a strategic position to exert great influence in the processes of university governance. Her role vis-a-vis her peers is greatly influenced by the setting, by the number of counterparts, and by the layers in the administrative hierarchy which separate her from the president. A dean is fortunate indeed, when she is required to report to and consult directly with only a few other administrators. The further one is removed from the top, the greater the likelihood that one's impact on institutional decision-making is minimized.

I consider myself fortunate. At my institution, a small university within a nine-member state university system, the Dean's Council comprises only seven academic deans. This council relates directly with the vice president for academic affairs and has at times worked as a group directly with the president of the university. The Dean's Council becomes the Academic Council when directors of programs, such as continuing education, general studies, and the graduate program, are combined with the group to consider broader issues. Five of the seven deans represent professional

schools--the schools of education, pharmacy, business, architecture, and nursing. Humanities and social sciences and science and technology are the other two schools represented.

Because the deans share similar problems, such as limited access to programs, enrollment caps, and limited resources, and because they share an understanding of professional issues, such as certification, accreditation, and licensure, the ease with which I have become a part of the council has been gratifying. Secondly, the place of nursing within the institution and the expressed commitment of the institution to the program in nursing are in no small measure related to the deans' support of nursing. But this is not always true. Deans can fall into a hierarchy all their own, sometimes based on programmatic criteria, sometimes based on perceived worth of a program, sometimes based on longevity of the program or programs within the institution, and sometimes based on interpersonal criteria. A dean may be a dean in name only. One criterion by which relative worth of deans is measured is the number and sources of written communications they receive; deans have been known to resort to playing the "did you receive" and "did you know" games.

Regardless of her perceived position in the institution, the dean represents her faculty's and students' interests within and without the institution. The channels of communication which she establishes and which she allows to be established will result in either greater or fewer links within and between the four groups and more or less involvement by all in the decision-making arenas of the institution.

Because I believe that the central mission of the university is carried out in interactions between students and teachers, I strongly believe that administrators are necessary to an institution to create an environment in which this mission can be carried out. As an administrator, then, the dean must maintain close contact with other administrators to be sure that faculty and students receive and give their full measure as they go about the business of developing and nurturing the intellect through teaching/learning, research, and service.

Administrators

Relationships with other administrtors, such as the university attorney, presidential assistants, vice presidents, and provosts, are critical because of these administrators' knowledge of the rules of procedure, interpretations of rules and contracts, and the processes dictated by the rules and because of the general necessity to define and respect the rights and responsibilities of all persons. These persons must be consulted frequently before problems arise. They must be consulted before policies internal to the unit in nursing are firmly fixed in stone. They are colleagues not only of the dean but of the faculty as well. In times of adversity, however, it is well to remember that they, like you, the dean, are members of the administration and must side with the organization in its behalf. The relationships established must provide for a two-way information flow as the dean may be consulted regarding issues perceived as peculiar to the health field, a professional field, or

nursing. The dean seizes the opportunity to provide information, knowing that the more informed the administration, the greater the likelihood of institutional support for nursing during the good years as well as the lean.

Unlike deans, vice presidents do not come a dime a dozen, but their numbers vary depending on the size and complexity of the institution. The dean is the primary link between the faculty and students and the administration at the level of vice president. Unlike the institutions of historical note on the continent, collegiality never really took root in American universities. In most institutions the president is selected and appointed by a board of regents or board of trustees; the president in turn appoints the administrators, including the vice presidents and deans. True collegiality resides only in departments which become self-perpetuating bodies and, to some extent, in faculty councils or senates, which have more or less control over academic matters. In the stretch, however, it is vice presidents, presidents, or regents who can overrule the faculty(4). The dean in her role can help the faculty by keeping it informed; she can also help the faculty by keeping the vice presidents informed. In practice, fulfilling this obligation to the faculty and students means establishing a regular mechanism for informing and consulting vice presidents. It may mean justifying to administrators on this level why they need certain pieces of information for both short-term and long-term goal fulfillment by the nursing unit. The president's time must be highly valued. The opportunities to confer with him directly must be seen as opportunities to inform him and to clarify and justify for him matters related to faculty, students, the academic program, and resources. Knowing how the president views his own role could go a long way in assisting the dean to use her moments with him to best advantage. In my setting, for example, the president prides himself on his knowledge of nursing and nursing education and in his experience in working with specific nursing issues at the national level. Our academic vice president shows equal concern for developments in nursing. We couldn't be in a better position.

I could go on, but I believe you have the picture. A look at the organizational chart will help to show the formal lines of organization. An unobstructed view of informal relationships--unobstructed, that is, by what you have seen on the chart--will give valuable information regarding how the structure works in the real world.

What I have described so far are some views of the setting and the organizational systems within which the dean carries out her service to faculty and students. Look with me briefly at some of the processes whereby these people, systems, and setting come together.

THE PROCESSES

Students have, perhaps a greater sphere of participation in decision-making when the academic unit in nursing is manned by a secure faculty. Stated differently, where faculty insecurity is high, student participation in decision-making is low. There are several levels of

participation by which students make known their views. There are few areas, however, in which students alone decide, and none of these areas involve policy decisions. In most instances, the areas in which students can make autonomous decisions are rather innocuous and derive from their activities in committees, organizations, and student government, all of which come under the authority of university-wide policies and/or the vice president for student affairs, the dean, or the faculty.

In nursing, students generally have their own organizations which they run under rules which they, for various reasons, have devised. The reasons are usually either related to professional concerns or supportive of the educational unit in nursing. The interest paid to student groups by the dean and the faculty determines in large measure the extent to which the organizations will survive and thrive.

The level of student participation granted by the governance documents of schools and colleges of nursing ranges from no participation to full student participation in voice and vote on what are essentially faculty committees. More often than not, however, committee meetings are held at times and places which limit student involvement. In general, we have not shown in practice that we believe students are capable of handling and interested in governance matters. But students, like faculty, have the option to make themselves heard by "exit" as well as by "voice"(5). And as the competition for resources becomes more intense, deans and the faculty will look more closely at the effect of the "exit" option on attrition and will take steps to curb attrition, once favored as a measure of program toughness. Deans may insist on this.

Checking the barometer of students' feelings and perceptions sometimes involves organized attempts to allow for the discussion and debate of issues without requiring vote and decision-making. The dean can encourage the faculty to permit student input at team meetings, at informal or formal faculty/student forums, at conversations with the dean on a particular day of the week, and in periodic small group gatherings by classes; such communication would help the dean and the faculty keep abreast of students' views of the curriculum and their progress through it.

Systematic and comprehensive techniques for providing information to students, as well as eliciting information from them, are essential. Conversations between students and the dean, exit interviews, and other encounters involving direct contact with students provide much-needed information. Written communication has the advantage of clarity if prepared with consultation, of brevity if prepared carefully, and of permanence if desired. Students are more than willing to share their thoughts when they see evidence that the dean has acted on the information received.

Institutional survival and quality education may well be partially based on student involvement with the faculty in academic programming and governance. There are natural limits to this student/faculty interface, based primarily on the inequalities between student and faculty power, particularly in matters related to curriculum, subject matter, evaluation and grading.

The dean can also tap faculty members as sources of valuable information if she provides for informal discussion and conversations between the faculty and the dean, holds open office hours when faculty are available, and encourages openness and frankness. The areas for informal discussion with the faculty, either individually or in groups, should center on problems or issues over which the faculty and/or dean have control.

The informal system, the grapevine, is essential to the health of the dean, and she must find ways to keep the flow of information steady and current. It is the quickest way to identify potential problems. It is not, however, a source of evidence that a particular problem exists. Evidence requires more careful search and scrutiny. Problems can sometimes be averted by paying attention to the "grapevine."

When both a dean and some faculty members are new, they have a tendency to develop closer than usual relationships, because neither has developed within the system a mechanism for collegial support. As the support comes from peers--the dean's support from deans and the faculty support from faculty--the need for this relationship lessens. It is important for the dean to understand this process and to realize that the strength of the faculty resides within the faculty and that there are some boundaries that she cannot cross.

The governance document of a school of nursing provides the primary basis for full faculty participation with voice and vote in matters of importance in the nursing unit. Faculties vary in the extent to which they exercise this authority. Not unlike the case with students, faculty interest varies with the issues and the perceived payoff. Some faculties are more highly organized than others. Some faculties are more insistent on exercising their rights to govern than others. One thing is certain. Faculty members are more likely to support policies, procedures, and processes when they have been instrumental in suggesting them, developing them, testing and revising them, and accepting them as useful for a variety of purposes. No matter how much you are respected as a dean, no matter how much you are liked, no matter how good your ideas, faculties have to experiment and develop their own ideas. After all, these become the rules by which faculty live. Ample opportunities must be provided for faculty-faculty exchange in order for this to occur. The dean is largely responsible for creating the atmosphere and the expectation that this will occur.

Deaning requires a respect for the faculty and for faculty decision-making. Painful as it sometimes seems, the faculty can make better decisions about some things. Supporting the faculty and assisting it in carrying out its decisions is as important as expecting and receiving support of the faculty for decisions one has made as dean. The dean, then, must make a conscious effort to check the barometer of faculty feelings and perceptions through formal and informal means.

These three areas, consultation, communication, and decision-making, are at the core of the collegial process. This process involves the dean with students, faculty members, other deans, and administrators in known procedures which serve to make easier the participation of each

group in policy making. To create and utilize such procedures in a college or university is to make colleagues of its management personnel and to provide for intensive collaboration of peers at all levels with all the constituencies of higher education institutions.

SUMMARY

Student Relationships

Schools, colleges, and departments of nursing are still, by and large, guilty of a tokenism which offers the promise but withholds the substance of participation in decision-making by students. The dean can foster positive relationships with students and provide a role model for faculty which will allow them to loosen up and accept the students as informed and informing participants in university governance.

Faculty Relationships

Deans and faculty members recognize that the collegial relationship is not intended to pervade all spheres of decision-making. The dean must frequently act decisively and quickly and must be astute enough to know when delays in decision-making are necessary. The dean defers to faculty expertise where appropriate and taps underdeveloped strengths to create rivals and strengthen the unit in nursing within the total university complex. The dean is lonely but is never truly alone, for she carries with her at all times the interests and needs of faculty members and students who share--indeed, who make up--a major part of her world in academe.

Dean Relationships

Not all deans are created equal. Nor do all deans practice deaning equally. The dean in nursing relates to other deans of professional schools, to deans of liberal arts colleges, and to deans of service units. The answers to the question, "What is a dean?" are so varied as to confuse the novice who aspires to such lofty heights. Assessing the relative position of deans on different days of the week, months of the year, and periods in the budget cycle becomes critical in terms of moving advantageously in behalf of one's constituencies. The dean-dean relationships are critical in decision-making, for at this level the vacillation between self-interests and university interests is at its greatest velocity, and information flow and exchange must be maintained. Allegiances are formed and re-formed, and political skirmishes won and lost in the battle for resources. But the strengths of the group of deans is never more apparent than when forces from without the institution threaten the integrity of the system. Deans are the true colleagues of deans with all the term entails, and the necessity for collegial relationships among groups of peers is nowhere more evident than in the making of decisions.

Administrative Relationships

Deans relate most often to vice presidents of academic affairs, executive vice presidents, and provosts, less often to presidents and to vice presidents of administration, student affairs, development, and so forth. The immediate superior is probably the most critical person as far as short-term and long-term academic/budgeting decisions are concerned. It is imperative, however, that the groundwork be laid for productive and harmonious relationships with all administrators, because, by and large, when they and their services are needed, there is time only for nurturing an effective working relationship, not for developing one.

Is It Possible?

The dean as colleague. Is it possible? Yes, under clearly defined circumstances the dean can be an associate in professional education in nursing. For most of those involved are in need of collegial support--neophytes and seasoned deans, the faculty, beginning and graduating students. In deliberately involving colleagues in decision making, the dean can facilitate the development of relationships in academe by building on past experiences, dealing with present realities, and projecting toward future imperatives.

In considering strategies for fostering and nurturing relationships with others in academe--students, faculty, deans, and administrators--remember that:

> Life is a sober reality, and to succeed in it, one must needs be prepared for it, or be buried under the dust thrown up by the heels of those forging ahead(6).

FOOTNOTES

1. Caleb Foote, Henry Mayer and Associates. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. The Majority Report of the Study Commission on University Governance, University of California, Berkeley. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968, p. 14.

2. Kenneth Boulding. "Quality versus Equality: The Dilemma of the University." Daedalus, II (Winter, 1975), p. 299.

3. Beaufort B. Longest. Management Practices for the Health Professional. Second edition. Reston, Va.: Reston Publishing Company, Inc., 1980, p. 50.

4. Boulding, op. cit., p. 299.

5. Albert O. Hirschman. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

6. Thomas Desaille Tucker, Annual Report. Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida A&M University, 1901.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Boulding, Kenneth. "Quality Versus Equality: The Dilemma of the University." Daedalus, II (Winter, 1975), pp. 298-303.

Brown, J. Douglas. The Commonplace Book Of An Academic Dean. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1978.

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. C. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Demerath, Nicholas J., Stephens, Richard W., and Taylor, R. Robb. Power, Presidents, and Professors. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Foote, Caleb, Mayer, Henry, and Associates. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. The Majority Report of the Study Commission on University Governance, University of California, Berkeley. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Hirschman, Albert O. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Longest, Beaufort B. Management Practices for the Health Professional. Second edition. Reston, Va.: Reston Publishing Company, Inc., 1980.

Mason, Henry L. College and University Government. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1978.

Millett, John D. Strengthening Community in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1974.

_____. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. and McConnell, T. R. Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

According to Marion M. Schrum . . .

> When an administrator is lonely she is no longer a leader understood by others. This kind of loneliness is common to persons who feel institutional problems are their problems. Instead of sharing them with the people involved and knowing the companionship of tackling problems together, they stagger around with burdens on their minds and hearts that they were never meant to carry. Doing this and living like this, they illustrate a lonely, self-centered approach to social responsibility.
>
> Jeanne Margaret McNally, R.N.. Ph.D.
> Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs
> The University of North Carolina
> Chapel Hill, North Carolina

In his autobiography, Gilbert Keith Chesterton wrote that often, lying in bed, he wished for a long brush so that he could use the large, uncluttered expanse of the ceiling to paint scenes with great freedom. The walls were useless to him because someone had always preceded him with wallpaper--which reminded him of the Biblical admonition, "Be not vainly repetitious as the Gentiles are." In her paper in Portland, Dr. Shannon covered the essence of the topic, "The Dean as a Colleague," rather comprehensively, leaving for me the risk of being "vainly repetitious." It might be easier for me to write "when a dean is not a colleague." For example:

- A dean is not a colleague when she sets salaries for the forthcoming year or makes the final recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.
- A dean is not a colleague when she must advise someone that his or her talents might be better recognized elsewhere.
- A dean is not a colleague when she must ward off covetous predators (at gunpoint if necessary) who wish to pre-empt the limited space in the school of nursing.

Humor aside, I would concur with Dr. Shannon in her use of Webster's definition of a colleague, "one chosen at the same time with another." I would expand this further, however, to indicate the following meaning from the Oxford English Dictionary: "To join in alliance, unite, associate. To enter into a league or alliance, to unite, to cooperate for a common end; also in a bad sense, to conspire, cabal."

Marion M. Schrum, R.N., Ph.D., is dean, Orvis School of Nursing, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, Nevada.

The collegial relationships which most deans encounter are highly varied. The independent variable which affects the degree of collegiality is the purpose around which the relationship is established. The collegiality of a relationship is also directly related to its position on an authoritarian-democratic continuum. In other words, the more authoritarian a dean may be the less likely is there to be a collegial relationship with the faculty. Stated another way, the level of collegiality varies substantively with the dean's administrative style.

Other factors which affect the dean's collegial relationships are the size and structure of the school. In a large school which has a large undergraduate enrollment, a multi-major master's program, a doctoral program, and an extensive continuing education program, the administrative structure may include the dean; an associate dean for the undergraduate program, who may have under his/her jurisdiction department chairmen or their counterparts; an associate dean for graduate education; a fiscal officer; and an admissions officer.

Of course there are variations in titles and organization. The point here, however, is that the dean in this type of setting would see these persons as colleagues closer than anyone else with whom she associates. Too, a dean of a school of this magnitude and complexity is likely to have many more commitments and relationships external to but not unrelated to the school. This may not always be true, but a dean who remains insular will either not survive long or will not be as effective in accomplishing the mission of the school. She must delegate some of the responsibilities of her office, and in doing so she relinquishes some contact with faculty members and the students. Ultimately, and legally, she is responsible for all that pertains to her school. Because of this, the collegial relationship between her and her associate or assistant deans must be close--and constant. They share the responsibility and accountability of her office, but in the final analysis the dean is ultimately accountable.

The dean in a smaller, less complex school has a different set of relationships. She may have much more day-to-day contact with both individual faculty members and students. Her support staff, for example, assistant or associate deans, may be either limited or nonexistent. She therefore lacks this type of collegial support. She may, in fact, find it only in the company of other deans in the college or university. I have spent my administrative career in these types of schools and can state categorically that they represent both rewards and hardships. The rewards come in the sense of closeness you feel with the faculty as you work out the day-to-day concerns related to the implementation of the school's mission. It is difficult when you are the single arbiter of faculty conflict and you have no one who understands as well or cares as much about the issues at stake. You may take it to your academic vice-president, but he is likely to remind you that it is <u>your</u> problem--which, of course, it is.

I might add here that the dean of a small school cannot ignore the importance of external collegial relationships. While they provide her

with something of an external support system, they are critical to the health and growth of the school. In sum, no dean can afford to be insular or narrow in her range of relationships. Let me illustrate from my own recent experience. In the two months that I have been at the University of Nevada I have

- met with other deans individually to determine where we might work together closely in areas of common interest;
- met with our agency personnel (directors of nursing) to share with them something about myself and to learn what they see as our mission;
- attended meetings of the boards of directors of the Nevada Nurses' Association, the Health Manpower Committee, and the Rural Health Coalition;
- been made chairman of the public affairs committee of the University Administrative Council;
- attended a dinner meeting of the Washoe County Medical Society;
- attended luncheons and a dinner given by the Nevada Chapter of the Association of General Contractors;
- been appointed to the search committee for the dean of continuing education;
- testified before a legislative committee re administration of medications by students; and
- participated in a videotaped interview regarding nursing needs in Nevada.

With the exception of the meetings with the legislators and the general contractors, there is in these contacts some measure of or potential for collegial relationships. I could recount a longer list if I were to detail some of my activities during my seven and one-half years in Wyoming. Suffice it to say that they included involvement at the state, regional, and national levels.

The deanship is clearly an administrative position, as described by Dr. Reres and Dr. Hawkins. The term "administrator" may perhaps belie the opportunity for colleagueship. As you well know, the definitions of the word are "to manage or direct; to give out or to dispense; to furnish help or be of service"(Webster). The first two of these suggest that the dean is doing something <u>to</u> others rather than <u>with</u> them. Faculty members clearly do not like to be <u>managed</u>, and anyone aspiring to a deanship should bear this in mind. They expect the dean to have certain management skills, as they relate to budget, resources, and so forth. Any suggestion, however, that the dean "manage" what they consider their professional prerogatives (academic freedom) is almost certain to do violence to a harmonious relationship.

Where, then, is there an opportunity for a collegial relationship between the dean and the faculty? It lies in perhaps the most important area of the school's existence, namely, setting its mission and goals. No one is likely to survive in the deanship very long if there is great disparity between the dean and the faculty on this point. It is true that

the dean must demonstrate vision for the school in the social context in which it exists. She needs to share this vision with the faculty and determine the extent to which it is compatible with the mission as defined by the faculty. It is in this area that the dean becomes a true colleague. The exchange of ideas (which can be at a high intellectual level and which must be practical) should ultimately result in a mutually determined statement of mission and goals. Once these are set, the collegial relationship becomes less clear because the dean and faculty have different responsibilities in the process of implementation. The mission and goals are realized through the faculty's teaching, research, and service activities. The dean, on the other hand, must assure the procurement and allocation of resources to make their work possible. These combined responsibilities, directed to the goals mutually defined, should lead to a sense of worth and accomplishment for all persons involved.

Several factors enter into this process of goal setting. The faculty rightfully expects some leadership of ideas from the dean, but not domination. Further, there is an expectation that the dean will foster a climate wherein there is a freedom of exchange. This freedom will prevail only when respect for the individual and his or her own ideas is maintained. Obviously this is not the dean's responsibility alone but one shared by the group. "Put-downs" from whatever source are never appreciated by those on whom they are imposed. None of us enjoys an erosion of our sense of personal worth.

The dean's collegial relationship with the administrative officers of the university (president and vice-president) is somewhat similar to that of the dean and faculty, that is, it varies with the context. In setting five- or ten-year goals for the university, the dean of nursing must be considered a colleague. She is less so when the budget she submits is trimmed or when she is evaluated for her performance. The dean is held accountable (or should be) for the quality of productivity within the educational unit for which she is responsible. I believe it is important here to stress again the effect of accountability on a collegial relationship. I believe it is naive to think that you are always, in the strict sense, a colleague of the individual to whom you are accountable.

This may seem to contradict some of my previous comments, but in fact it does not. Setting goals can be a mutual (collegial) effort where ideas are independent of any hierarchy. Implementation, however, does give rise to a hierarchical structure wherein accountability emerges. Accountability connotes evaluation, and this definitely effects the texture of a relationship.

So far as other deans are concerned, I have no question about the parameters of our collegial relationship. We all sit on administrative councils or advisory councils as peers. We are there from our respective units to carry forth our share of the university's mission. Some deans of nursing still feel the need (or are made to feel the need) to defend their presence in a university. I carry no such feeling into my relationships with other deans, and I subsequently have not been on the defensive. (Incidentally, I have long ago stopped apologizing because nursing is more

expensive than some other disciplines.) Obviously, the dean of nursing works more closely with some deans than others. Much of this is determined, of course, by the nature of the discipline.

Competing for the available resources of the university is obviously an area where collegiality among deans becomes somewhat more obscure. Each has a responsibility to seek the resources for the conduct of his or her academic unit. Even here, however, with prudently developed relationships, deans can support each other through collaborative, interdisciplinary programs which minimize duplication of effort. Most certainly a dean of nursing cannot beat her own drum at the expense of someone else. Tempting as it might be, she must not ask the president to cut the medical school budget to assure the fiscal health of the nursing school. Neither is it to her advantage to use feminist arguments to ensure the support of her discipline. One notable exception to this may be when there is documented evidence of salary discrepancies in comparable academic preparation, experience, and productivity.

For me, at least, it is somewhat more difficult to talk about a collegial relationship with students. Of course, if we are on committees together and have a common purpose of completing a task, we are, in a sense, colleagues. I do not believe the students expect or even want to be the dean's colleagues. I believe they want the dean's respect, and they want to be treated fairly. I believe further that they expect the dean to be knowledgeable, capable at what she does, and compassionate. They should know who the dean is and something about what he or she is about. The distance between the dean and the student is considerable when viewed within the power construct. Within the authority of her office, the dean has a considerable amount of power--certainly much more than the individual student. It might be noted here, however, that when this power is misused extensively and in a sustained manner the resulting student power can become awesome. A lot of people learned that in the sixties! I am digressing, however, from the concept of collegiality. If we are colleagues, the students and I, in any true sense, it is in our common aspirations for the well-being of society which we serve or plan to serve.

Reference is made, in your program, to the dean's collegial relationships with faculty, students, and administrators. Two other groups must be recognized within this context, namely, the staff within the school and the multitude of staff members in the university generally. While secretaries do not often have much to say about setting the goals of the school, they have a great deal to do with their implementation. To this end, they too are colleagues. They are an integral part of the scheme of things, and their absence would make the accomplishment of our goals infinitely more difficult.

The other group, of course, is the nursing service personnel who provide the clinical laboratory facilities for our students. Schools vary in the extent to which nursing service participates in the development of mission and goals. Almost throughout our history we have heard about the gap between nursing service and education. We have heard insidious comments about the "ivory tower" and the "real world." A variety of

factors contribute to this gap. Among these may very well be the extent to which a dean allows herself to become isolated (and sometimes alienated) from her counterpart in nursing service. Much can be gained by the dean who emphasizes that both education and service must carry out nursing's mandate from society and who then establishes a collegial relationship with those engaged in nursing practice. Such a relationship makes the faculty's job easier and the students' learning richer.

In our school the administrators of nursing service and their assistants for education and the directors of community health agencies attend our curriculum committee meetings. In addition, the dean has periodic meetings with the administrators. Both of these activities create an opportunity for them to participate in the educational mission of the school. Obviously, the responsibility for the quality of the program belongs to the dean and the faculty, but this kind of collegial relationship properly designed can only enhance the quality of the program. Too, it can provide us with the opportunity to influence, in whatever measure, the quality of care in the clinical agencies. (Incidentally, these meetings can also serve to dispel the notion that deans are awesome, aloof, over-educated, unrealistic idealists.)

In sum, if you aspire to a deanship, you must be prepared to establish and maintain a virtual kaleidoscope of collegial relationships. As noted at the outset, the depth and scope of these will vary but all will emanate from the mission of the school. Their success depends to a very great extent on the dean's feeling about people and, more significantly, how she feels about herself. It is a position that requires a lot of giving--and a lot of taking. On the giving end, Kahlil Gibran said it best: "He who is worthy to drink from the stream of life is worthy of a sip from your small cup."

According to Anna M. Shannon. . .

As preparation for organizing my thoughts about the topic, "Dean As Colleague," I read a series of articles about administration, searched my reprint file, and engaged in a great deal of introspection. As you will be able to see from my list of references, introspection and the application of previous learning provided the substance of the paper.

In order to address this topic, I will first define my use of the word "colleague." This step is necessary if we are to communicate at all. Following that step I will, through the use of some definitions and examples, speak to the question, "Who are the dean's colleagues?"

The next section of the paper deals with an assessment of one's beliefs about self, others, role and institutions as essential to goal-directed relationships such as colleagueships. Examples will be used to demonstrate the utility of this approach. Finally, the theory of interpersonal relations that guides me in my collegial and other relationships will be explained through vignettes.

DEFINITION OF COLLEAGUE

Although Webster (1976) starts with a rather restrictive construction of colleague as derived from French and Latin with an emphasis on "one chosen at the same time with another," the common usage has broadened to include partnerships, fellow professionals, and associates in an organization. The definition of colleague, then, must be further broken down to specify what is meant by "partnership," by "fellow professional," and by "organizations," as relevant to the role of the dean. "Partnership" refers to a relationship in which there is joint interest and association, a common goal. "Fellow professional" refers to the various professional associations of the dean, including other nurses, other professors, and other administrators. "Organizations" refers to the "structures" or "consolidated group of elements" or "a body of persons organized for some specific purpose" (Webster, 1976).

Therefore, a colleague, in this paper, is a person with whom one has a relationship wherein there is joint interest and association (or partnership) within the context of a body of persons organized for some specific purpose (or organization). The critical elements are:

- There is a relationship.
- The relationship is based on joint interest.
- The relationship is the result of an organizational association.

Anna M. Shannon, D.N.S., F.A.A.N., is dean, School of Nursing, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.

THE DEAN'S COLLEAGUES

Who are the dean's colleagues? If one looks back to the definitions one can say that the dean's colleagues are other persons with whom the dean shares an organizational base, has a joint interest, and with whom he or she engages in relationships because of this mutual interest. You will recall that an organization has a purpose; in colleagueship, this purpose is mutual, that is, of joint or equal benefit to each. Some may say that this definition is too restrictive--that the dean is colleague to many. I would assert that the dean has many relationships with many persons, but I would further assert that, although the dean has multiple relationships with each given person in a close working situation, only some of these relationships are collegial--others are adversarial, hierarchical, friendly, and some are even filled with enmity.

These various relationships differ in terms of the goal of the relationship. In a colleagueship the goal is a partnership of mutual interest and arises from an association in an organization. An adversarial relationship in our current litigious age seems to be defined by law, for example, the adversarial relationships between dean and faculty in some situations of collective bargaining. A hierarchical relationship is defined by the organization's line relationships whether military, ecclesiastical, or familial. It is always wise to remember that the title, "dean," and the office of the dean can call up old feelings about authority in people irrespective of who is occupying the title or office at the time--as we in psychiatric nursing have been known to say, "Oedipus lives."

Friendly relationships are defined by mutual affection, are not dependent upon organization origins or role, and have the goal of exchange of affection. Relationships characterized by enmity have the goal of the exchange of hostility and rancor.

These four types of relationships are not all of the types possible but are listed here to provide a contrast with collegial relationships and because they are common associations in which a dean engages. The point of this background information is to provide a logical way of discriminating among these relationships. It is also to provide knowledge and to facilitate those relationships which could best be collegial toward the behaviors that characterize such a relationship.

The groups of persons within which a dean will probably have colleague relationships are these: professional nurses active in the city, state, region and nation; professional nursing educators; other nursing deans, directors, chairmen, and other top-boss titles in nursing education; other deans in the university or college; and vice-presidents and presidents in the university or college. In each instance the mutuality of the goal will determine the colleagueship.

There is an annual ritual at my university that has the capacity for being played out in any of the relationship forms mentioned above. Each spring, about income tax time, coincidentally, each dean meets with the vice-president and the business manager to make final that year's

budget. Excess funds are identified and relinquished; shortage areas are identified and handled by reappointment, hiring or travel freeze, and similar tactics. I am sure that each dean approaches that meeting differently. Some, because of their experiences and their beliefs about role, self, and others, set up an adversary cat and mouse game. Others, because of their beliefs and experience, may try the "old-boy," friendship manipulation. Others respond most to the hierarchical components of the relationship.

Within this situation, because of the natures of the vice president and the business manager, it is possible to have a colleague relationship if those two persons and the dean are engaged in a joint venture with mutual interests and common purpose. Within this situation, when acting as colleagues, the three persons will use techniques of compromise and cooperation. When, in the course of this meeting, areas of mutual interest are greatest, the participants collaborate well and are most satisfied with the interaction.

The difference between cooperation and collaboration is an important one in this context. In cooperation the parties to the interaction are each moving toward the same goal, each for his own satisfaction. In collaboration each party is moving toward the same goal, but the partner's reaching the goal, as well as reaching it oneself, becomes a second, equally important goal. Competition is not appropriate to a colleague relationship, which is characterized by mutuality of goal.

Relationships with one's faculty members are an interesting kaleidoscope of interactions; a colleague relationship is possible when the goal is appropriately mutual, with each person bringing similar power to its resolution. I believe that a dean can sit on committees, as a faculty member, with other faculty members, and work toward the solution of a problem. However, the problem must be real and within the province of the group and the exercise true. It can not be one of those dreadful situations wherein the dean is waiting for the group to read his/her mind.

I was discussing the topic of this paper with one of our faculty members and middle managers. She had assumed that I would include faculty members among the dean's colleagues and she commented that in no other relationship was the two-way directness of each party's responsibility so vivid as it was when dean and faculty member interact as colleagues. She went on to say that when a faculty member was not ready for the two-way responsibility, colleagueship could not exist and the dean's role became one of facilitating that readiness in the other person--probably because of the hierarchical nature of the relationship at that time.

Relationships with other deans in one's university or college can be collegial when the goal is of mutual interest. At our school we are close colleagues when seeking improved funding for the library, supporting programs with outside funding, and when the heart of the institution is under attack. However, when it comes to allocation of faculty lines, operations budget, and capital, our goals may differ markedly. Because of our larger, long-time, mutual goal of a strong institution, we may shift from competition to compromise and back again. It is essential for the

dean to closely monitor these shifts in goal as an interaction progresses; in this formulation, one's actions are goal-directed and may seem inappropriate to others if one's goal has not kept pace with the shifts or if the group is not informed that the dean is not in agreement with a shift in goal. In these negotiations, which can be intense and can have long-term ramifications, it is essential that the dean knows his/her school's or college's goals (long- and short-term) and that the interaction is continuously monitored in terms of its probably effect on those goals.

Relationships with other nurses in one's state and community can be collegial. Much of the responsibility for maintaining the collegial nature, in my opinion, lies with the dean. Usually the two persons will be unequal in education, breadth of experience, and, sometimes, age. The hierarchical nature of nursing education in the past may make it very difficult for a nurse to see the "person" in the "dean" and to function as a colleague. I contend that the better educated, more experienced, public servant--the dean--has the major responsibility for establishing a climate to move these relationships toward the mutual goal--colleagueship.

Relationships with other nursing deans are essential for mutual survival. All four types of relationships may exist, but the one most essential is the colleague relationship. When deans share mutual professional goals and design their interactions around them, the result can be supportive when deans are under fire, gratifying when their goals are reached, and reassuring when doubts assail them.

I believe that deaning is interpersonally demanding and draining. One must interact with many persons in many situations. This aspect of the job cannot be neglected. If one is not available at a specific time, a surrogate dean needs either to fill in or to make the decision that a specific interaction is not necessary or can be handled in another way.

ASSESSMENT OF ONE'S BELIEFS

In order to have the kind of deliberate, goal-directed interactions that I have described, it is essential to make a careful assessment of your beliefs about yourself, others, your profession, your role, your school, and your university. In addition, I find it useful to have a framework, or theory, that specifies the essential variables to guide my interactions. First I'll discuss the assessment of one's beliefs.

As a practice teacher years ago, I had an assignment that I've used many times since in situations where I needed a clearer understanding of myself. The assignment was for each class member to write her beliefs about students, about the teacher's role, and about how learning is effected. From these statements of belief we then derived awareness of incongruities, ways of resolving these incongruities and, then, strategies for teaching. This method can be used in approaching the problems of making explicit one's own needs, principles, strengths, tolerances, and Achilles' heels.

Statements of belief about oneself can include one's biases, tolerances, preferences, principles, modes of work, and, especially, one's sore

points or Achilles' heels. You don't need to tell other people about these (especially not about your Achilles' heels); they are for your own use. These statements of belief are then cross-checked with beliefs about other areas, such as beliefs about your role.

An example may help. I believe that I am able to tolerate and function well in committee meetings where decisions must evolve slowly from the group. I also believe that faculty involvement in recommending policy is essential if the policy is to be followed. Further, I believe that the dean should inform the faculty of resource limitations that would restrict policy recommendations (for example, a budget to support a 1:8 faculty/student ratio makes a faculty recommendation of 1:4 meaningless). Therefore, a faculty committee structure that allows the dean to function both as a (hierarchical) resource person in terms of finances, policies, etc., and as a colleague within the same meeting is a structure compatible with my beliefs about myself, others, and my role. In terms of strategy, these beliefs tell me that I must constantly monitor and clarify for myself and for the group whether I'm functioning as a resource person or as a colleague.

Statements of belief about one's role within the university or college are helpful. For example, when I was a department chairman at The University of California, I believed that my relationship to the president of the university was so remote as to be meaningless. As dean of Montana State my relationship with the president is much closer, collegial in some situations; I not only know his first name but also call him by it. This change was primarily related to the size of the institution, not to my role, but my belief system had to change or I could have been treating a person in a small informal setting like a total stranger.

One more example may make my point clearer. I believe that I am a spokesperson for the School of Nursing in all respects except specific course content and selection of learning experiences, and I further believe that I am a spokesperson for the university in terms of its goals, needs, levels of excellence, and general contributions to the state. I do not believe that I am a spokesperson for the College of Art and Architecture, except insofar as I am a spokesperson for the university.

Although the goals of the school or college are not statements of belief, the dean needs to have them and the way they fit with the goals of the parent institution clearly in mind. Some of these goals relate to size, curricula, degree of excellence, and emphasis (for example, research versus teaching) and are the primary responsibility of the faculty. Others express administrative aims and are the primary responsibility of the dean. An example of the latter type of goal from my school might help explicate what I mean. We are a five-campus school with resident faculty at each geographic location. One of my goals is "one school." That goal or assumption guides me in faculty matters such as promotions, tenure, and merit; in curriculum decisions such as equivalency; in student matters such as assignment; and in resource allocation.

THEORY OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

All of this previous discussion has been undergirded, for me, by a theory of interpersonal relationships. Those who know me will not be surprised when I say that my interpersonal relationships, insofar as they are guided by anything, are guided by Sullivanian theory. This theory helps me because it points out the essential variables to be considered in any relationship and differentiates relationships characterized by competition, cooperation, compromise, and collaboration (Sullivan, 1953). I will not give you a full exposition of Sullivan's Interpersonal Theory (although that task would be easier than the one in which I'm engaged) but, rather, will give a short-hand version of parts of the theory in order to demonstrate its utility.

First, one must take an overall view of human behavior as stated by Mabel Cohen in the introduction to Sullivan's book, Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry (1953). She states that Sullivan assumes "that human behavior is positively directed toward goals of collaboration and of mutual satisfaction and security unless interfered with by anxiety." This statement of the theory is positively oriented and is akin to the grace side of the religious argument as to whether man was born in sin or grace.

This statement when applied to collegial relationships means that both persons engaged in the relationship will be working collaboratively toward their mutual goal, mutual satisfaction, and security. It further states that what hinders this positively directed behavior is anxiety.

This summary statement by Mabel Cohen is a deceptively simple construction of a complex theory. As stated, without an understanding of the developmental factors and the interaction of concepts within the theory, few would see its utility and many would label it absurd. These latter persons would ask "How can you believe that 'human behavior is positively directed' when we have so much evidence to the contrary?"

Each of us grows up (and continues growing) through a series of experiences. Each of these experiences when truly "lived, undergone and the like," in Sullivan's terms, changes us. Each interpersonal situation or interaction in which we engage helps develop, through experience, patterns of behavior. Patterns develop as a result of categorizing interactions into comparable, internally consistent, groups. This same process occurs in any need-satisfaction theory, but Sullivan's emphasis on experience as a changing force provides for me the useful concept that each interpersonal situation is new and that each individual coming to the situation is a different person from the person he was at the last encounter. It seems to me, in retrospect, that some of my greatest errors have been the result of entering an interrupted interpersonal situation as if it were an unchanged continuation--in other words, my errors were the result of my not being open to experience, of not having changed.

The second hopeful aspect of the concept of experience, of course, is the underlying assumption that people can change if they can be helped to experience. In a relationship that would be most productive if collegial, the dean who uses this theory as a guide would enter each

encounter ready to work toward a mutual goal, ready to collaborate, but willing to cooperate if the other was not yet ready for collaboration. No matter how one hopes, one party to an interaction cannot have a mutual goal; one person can accept another's goal as his or her own, but one person cannot be mutual.

Through these series of experiences that have developed into patterns, one develops foresight. Foresight is the ability to predict the future (usually the immediate future). Foresight is developed by repetitive experiences of "y" being the outcome of "x." Foresight is necessary if one is to function without abject terror.

In my previous example of entering each interpersonal situation as if it were a new one, the dean, ready to collaborate, would have, from experience and foresight, a good idea from immediate reactions as to whether or not collaboration was in the cards for that day. I am not recommending a Pollyanna approach wherein the dean would be going in saying, "Hit me again," but am suggesting, rather, that foresight would provide him or her with some notion as to the probabilities of success of a given action based on its previous outcomes in similar situations.

Anxiety is a part of the human condition; it is interpersonally derived and interpersonally mitigated; it is necessary for learning; it is disruptive of interpersonal relationships; it is the opposite, in experience, of self-esteem. Since anxiety is the pervasive force that helps to shape us as we develop patterns of behavior to avoid or minimize this threat, we can describe our unique personalities as being made up of those patterns of experience that have been successful in satisfying our needs and maintaining our security or self-esteem.

Anxiety is the force that interferes with the "positive direction" of behavior. Anxiety in the adult, according to Sullivan, occurs when one's self-esteem is threatened or when there is the anticipation of a threat to one's self-esteem. In fact, Sullivan suggests that when an interaction is threatened or starts to disintegrate one should ask the questions, "What am I doing that could threaten his self-esteem?" or "What is going on that is attacking my self-esteem?" This strategy is very useful and one tht a dean gets to practice very often.

Collaboration, the type of interaction that characterizes the highest level of colleagueship, is not going to occur if anxiety, in any party, interferes. Remember, one person cannot be mutual. Cooperation in a collegial relationship that still allows some protection to one's own self- esteem since the goal is mutual but the concern with the partner's satisfaction is not an additional goal. Collaboration is a very mature form of interaction, infrequently encountered. It may be that cooperation in colleagueship is the highest level of interaction we can anticipate. If this statement is true, the dean will need to monitor the need satisfaction sequences carefully so that he or she is not still working on mutual goal number 3 when others have achieved it and moved on to goals 4 and 5.

What forms does anxiety take that interfere with colleagueship? I have had the very interesting experience of having a relationship alter drastically because it took place in my office. The association was with

a faculty member with whom I had had collegial, hierarchical, and friendly relationships. The subject we discussed, that is, the content, was a subject we had discussed previously in all three types of relationships. However, on one particular occasion (subsequently repeated) the faculty member's behavior showed overt signs of anxiety (trembling, strident voice, multiple shifts of posture) yet the only discernable difference was that the interaction took place in the office of the dean. My guess is that old negative experiences with the trappings of authority interfered with the interaction.

Anxiety, contrary to the popular view, is not present only when its concomitant physiological states, such as palpitation, diaphoresis, trembling, are observable. Since experience with anxiety in interpersonal relationships developmentally forms our personalities, our habitual ways of behaving (our defenses) have been developed to avoid or minimize anxiety. When, in interaction, one sees a "hardening" or rigidifying of a pattern of behavior (sometimes called a hardening of the categories) one can ask of oneself, "what is the threat to self-esteem in this situation?" I typically categorize these in psychiatric terms since those categories provide me with the chracteristic behaviors and a repertoire of actions to break up the anxiety-produced habitual behavior. Other categories can be developed dependent on a person's background. For those of you who would consider psychiatric terms to be "labeling," another set of categories would be preferable.

An example of this type of interference with interaction from my experience will be given. Although not a dean at the time, I was meeting with a group of faculty members (as I had with others) to listen to their goals, their hopes, their directions, so that I could be sufficiently informed to represent them clearly. I had sought to set up a colleague relationship with cooperation as the type of interaction. Unfortunately, very early in the meeting, I described the purpose of the meeting as one in which they would justify their program to me so that I could be their spokesperson. For this particular group the word "justify" triggered a series of behaviors typified by suspiciousness, doubt as to my sincerity, and competition. The meeting ended almost before it began with no exposition of goals, hopes, or direction but with plenty of rancor directed toward me. I cannot give an explanation of why this series of events occurred but can only describe how an anxiety protection pattern disintegrated an interaction. I can assure you that my anxiety level did not stay at point zero since my self-esteem was, and is, closely connected to being competent in my work, and I had just had ample evidence that, at that moment, I was not.

I will give one final example of how anxiety can disrupt colleagueship. A year ago our biennial budget was being allocated within the university. The president had a series of faculty groups working on guidelines and the time had come, as was the custom, for each dean to meet with the vice president to receive word of his or her allocation. The nursing program had been growing steadily in quality, the faculty had received many compliments for a job well done (as had the dean), and although nursing was still not recognized as a high cost program by the

legislature, I had no reason to expect any budget other than an across-the-board salary increase. My previous associations with the vice president had been cordial and, often, collegial.

I felt a tension when I entered the room, but I thought it could be left over from a previous appointment. However, without much preliminary stagesetting I was told that the university faculty committee (tired of subsidizing nursing in a time of retrenchment) recommended the same 19:1 student/faculty ratio for us that they had to live with and a reduction from 52 to 23 faculty positions--a 46 percent reduction. In my state of intense anxiety, I laughed. The administration, he said, knew that 23 faculty members were not sufficient and were allocating 41. I laughed again and told him I had out more letters of intent than 41 positions.

I won't finish the story--which worked out to 48.24 faculty positions and 2.44 administrative positions--but rather will describe how anxiety interfered with this colleague relationship. As I mentioned, many previous contacts were collegial. Although most interaction was on a cooperative level, there had been instances of collaboration with the intense satisfaction that accompanies that. The tension in the room was, undoubtedly, related to what the vice-president had to tell me. He reverted to a hierarchical relationship when my patterns of behavior were set for collegial. Our goals were not congruent. His pronouncement of allocation of resources hit me where I hurt, in my self-esteem about my competence on the job, my plans for the school's future, my hopes for Montana's level of nursing care. My anxiety was acute. We had little interaction. Realizing that anxiety would interfere with my memory, I took notes. I said little, not trusting my voice or what verbal form my anxiety might take. I extracted a promise that I could prepare a rebuttal and present it to the Executive Budget Committee.

The rest of my day was shot. I ranted and raved at my assistant and used a wide range of anxiety-alleviating behaviors--some quite regressive. The next day I got to work on my rebuttal.

In this analysis I would say that the vice-president was also anxious, that he could predict my displeasure and hurt as a result of my resource allocations, and he did not wish to inflict that pain because it would be in conflict with his view of himself as a person and would, therefore, affect his self-esteem.

Fortunately, despite the intense anxiety, we were each able to "experience" the interaction (in Sullivanian terms), and subsequent interactions have been characterized by the appropriate type of relationship and form of interaction, many being collegial and collaborative.

SUMMARY

Colleagueship, as defined for this paper, is a relationship based on a partnership, on mutual goals, and arises from organizational association. The types of interaction appropriate to a collegial relationship are cooperation, compromise, and collaboration. Competition as a type of interaction is not congruent with this definition of colleagueship.

The purpose of this paper has been to demonstrate the utility of having an explicit set of beliefs and a theoretical framework for guiding one's interactions with other professionals. In addition, the collegial relationship has been given a restrictive definition so that the mutual goal of this relationship can shape the behaviors in it. Finally, my purpose in conveying the ideas and examples in this paper is that you may be spared some of the confusion that results from simpy living it without first thinking it.

REFERENCES

Sullivan, Harry Stack, Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton Co., 1953.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1976.

Final Word

My talented colleagues who were responsible for both the design and implementation of AACN's first Executive Development Series are full of bright ideas. They also have an uncanny knack of getting to me where my defenses are weakest--they said that they needed my help! I protested that I didn't know how to write an afterword or epilogue but admitted that I had been among the "concerned deans" who began meeting together in the 1960s. I was hooked.

However, it was my predecessor, Dr. Mary Kelly Mullane, who was the guiding spirit of a task force that helped develop the plan for "Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators." A grant application had been submitted just prior to Dr. Mullane's departure from the AACN office, but when I arrived a month later, in September 1978, its future was in a "who knows" state.

Very frankly, after retiring from 11 years in a deanship and a total of 24 years as a "nurse academic administrator," I was trying very hard to unlearn how to be a dean and to concentrate on learning how to act as an executive director. The two roles are very different. But AACN was destined to be lucky; approval of the grant application came in February, with funding in the early fall of 1979. Thus, although not the midwife, I became a sort of foster mother to the new offspring.

Happily, my fears that AACN might not be able to provide a proper climate for optimal growth and development of the long-awaited child proved groundless. Recruitment of dedicated imaginative project staff members resulted in a whirlwind of activity. The Executive Development Series was launched in April 1980 and has kept to a busy and productive schedule ever since.

The response from participants across the country has been heartening. It has strengthened the conviction of the original task force (later the advisory committee) that programs of this type could be organized, presented, and evaluated and that they provided a beginning exposure/experience to what academic administration in nursing was all about--which learners would use in various ways.

It is my feeling that these monographs well illustrate at least two important truths. One is diversity--there is not and should not be one way to achieve success as a "nurse academic administrator." The other is that the need for continuing effort and growth must be acknowledged. The topics addressed in these monographs were purposely chosen as introductory. There is a great need for more knowledge and deepening of skills; learning must be a constant process.

But regardless of favorable evaluations on the Executive Development Series, I should not leave the reader with the impression that we (the AACN, including the project) had escaped criticism. A couple of questions which were directed at me personally were "How do you define a 'distinguished dean'?" and "Didn't you look at a map before selecting Baltimore and Richmond as sites representative of the south?" As I have

stressed above, we live and learn--and the wise administrator benefits from criticism as well as from praise.

Personally, I still am learning how to be an executive director. It isn't easy and I have ups and downs as I did when I was a dean. I wasn't educated to use the term "administrative style" but have been told mine tends to be an odd combination of caution and risk-taking. Thus, I tend to regard the outcomes of the "Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators" grant in my cautious foster mother role; while I believe that we have done well, I hope that a continuation grant will give us the opportunity to do even better. I also will admit that the experience which AACN as an organization has gained from working with the total grant program, of which the Executive Development Series was a part, has broadened our organizational horizons and provided valuable visibility to the achievement of our goals.

Marion I. Murphy, R.N., Ph.D., F.A.A.N.
Executive Director, AACN

List of Participants

* Indicates individuals who attended both workshop sessions.

Eastern Region

* Beatrice Adderly-Kelly, Howard University, Washington, DC

* Patricia J. Baldwin, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
Wilsie Bishop, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN
* Katherine C. Bobbitt, Medical College of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA
* Rachel Z. Booth, University of Maryland at Baltimore, MD
Gwendolyn E. Braxton, Delaware State College, Dover, DE
* Kay Richards Broschart, Hollins College, Hollins College, VA
* H. Terri Brower, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL

* Rita M. Carty, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
* Patricia T. Castiglia, SUNY-Buffalo, NY
Patricia Chamings, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN
* Elizabeth Clanton, University of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC
* Helene M. Clark, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC
Constance Cleary, Columbia University, New York, NY
Mona Counts, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
* Beverly L. Craig, Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory, NC

* Elnora Daniel, Hampton Institute, Hampton, VA
* Ada Romaine Davis, College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore, MD
* Dorothy DeMaio, Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey, Newark, NJ
Margaret Duckworth, Tift College, Forsyth, GA
Arline M. Duvall, Clemson University, Clemson, SC

Ann Earle, Columbia University, New York, NY
* Frances R. Eason, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC
Linda A. Ellis, Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, GA

Sister Mary Finnick, Widener University, Chester, PA
Sister Mary Jean Flaherty, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC
* Marita E. Frain, Villanova University, Villanova, PA

* Roberta G. Gropper, Bowie State College, Bowie, MD

Joanne E. Hall, Duke University, Durham, NC
Shirley L. Hale, University of Maryland at Baltimore, MD
Virginia J. Harris, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

Eastern Region (continued)

* Malissa Harkleroad, University of Maryland at Baltimore, MD
* Caroline Hollshwandner, Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales, Center Valley, PA
* Lois Hoskins, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC
* Jacqueline Hott, Adelphi University, Garden City, NY
Elizabeth Hughes, Georgetown University, Washington, DC
* Elizabeth A. Humphrey, Louisiana State University Medical Center at New Orleans, LA
Carol Hutton, Barry College, Miami, FL

* Fannie M. Jackson, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, NC
Marilyn-Lu Jacobsen, Wright State University, Dayton, OH
Lucille A. Joel, Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey, Newark, NJ
* Barbara L. Judkins, CUNY-Herbert H. Lehman College, Bronx, NY

* Dorothy Kennedy, University of Delaware, Newark, DE
* Carole Ann Kimbrough, Youngstown State University, Youngstown, OH
* Carol Knowlton, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC
* Judith Krauss, Yale University, New Haven, CT

* Helen Lerner, CUNY-Herbert H. Lehman College, Bronx, NY
Clara M. Long, York College of Pennsylvania, York, PA
Susan Ludington, Georgetown University, Washington, DC

* Suzanne MacAvoy, Fairfield University, Fairfield, CT
Elizabeth McFarlane, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC
Rose Ann McGarrity, Georgetown University, Washington, DC
* Leda McKenry, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL

* Ann S. Madison, University of Maryland at Baltimore, MD
Lois Malasanos, University of Florida-Gainesville, FL
* Melody J. Marshall, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC
* Virginia Mermel, Georgetown University, Washington, DC
Fay Miller, CUNY-Medgar Evers College, Brooklyn, NY

* Mary Naylor, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA
Ivy Nelson, University of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC
Antonia H. Nowell, University of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC

* Marya Olgas, Medical College of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA
Carol Osman, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

Mary Ann C. Parsons, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC
Shannon Perry, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN
Alice Phillips, Holy Family College, Philadelphia, PA

Eastern Region (continued)

* Constance B. Pratt, Rhode Island College, Providence, RI
  Linda Coniff Pugh, York College of Pennsylvania, York, PA

* Johanne A. Quinn, Boston College, Boston, MA

* Alice G. Rini, Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights, KY
* Mary Ann Rose, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

  Edna Saxton, Hartwick College, Oneonta, NY
  Irene Sell, Long Island University Center, Greenvale, NY
  Evelyn Singer, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA
* Enrica K. Singleton, Louisiana State University Medical Center at New Orleans, LA
  Mary Ann Snodgrass, York College of Pennsylvania, York, PA
* Ruth A. Stephens, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL

  Gloria A. Tanner, Clemson University, Clemson, SC
  Mary Tilbury, University of Maryland at Baltimore, MD

  Marjorie A. Viehl, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI

  Jean M. Watson, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC
* Lynne Brodie Welch, Pace University, New York, NY
* Rita Reis Wieczorek, CUNY-Hunter College-Bellevue, New York, NY
  Eliza Wolff, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC
  Alma Wolley, Stockton State College, Pomona, NJ

  Beverly Zimmerman, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ

Midwestern Region

* Winona B. Ackerman, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC
  Margaret Adamson, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND
  Natalie Atkins, College of St. Teresa, Winona, MN

* Lorraine Berlin, Mercy College of Detroit, MI
  Della Blackburn, Marion College, Marion, IN
  June M. Bradley, University of Manitoba, Canada
* Marilyn M. Bunt, Loyola University of Chicago, IL
  Candace Burns, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

  Patricia A Calico, Thomas More College, Fort Mitchell, KY
  Grace H. Chickadonz, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH
  Mary Clark, Doctoral Candidate and Health Consultant, Chicago, IL
* Stephanie Clatworthy, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI
  Sue C. Cleveland, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS

Midwestern Region (continued)

Nadine A. Coudret, University of Evansville, IL
Elaine W. Cowen, Indiana University/Purdue University, Fort Wayne, IN
* Margaret T. Crepeau, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI
Colleen Curtin, Grand Valley State College, Allendale, MI

Lucille Davis, St Xavier's College, Chicago, IL
Donna Deane, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
* Lillian Del Papa, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, AR
Emily Droste-Bielek, Grand Valley State College, Allendale, MI

Bernadine Feldman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
* Madeleine R. Finneran, University of Pittsburgh, PA

* Shirley A. George, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN
* Valerie D. George, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH
* Sandra A. Greniewicki, Brenau College, Gainesville, GA

* Eleanor K. Herrmann, Yale University, New Haven, CT
* Betty J. Hill, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, MI
Carol Hill, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND
* Patricia A. Hinton, Northwest Mississippi Regional Medical Center, Clarksdale, MS
Julienne Hoff, Mercy College of Detroit, MI
* Sharon E. Hoffman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
Ida A. Horvitz, University of Cincinnati, OH
* Mary H. Huch, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS
Samuel T. Hughes, Mississippi College, Clinton, MS
* Elissa K. Isaacson, Lewis University, Romeoville, IL

Sandra L. Jamison, Marion College, Marion, IN
Agnes J. Janoscrat, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, WI

Nori I. Komorita, University of Illinois-Urbana, IL
* Phyllis B. Kritek, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, WI

* Jeanette Lancaster, University of Alabama, Birmingham, AL
Rosemary A Langston, Winona State University, Winona, MN
* Jerri D. Laube, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS
* Leah M. Leone, College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, MN
Marion D. Lewis, SUNY at Stony Brook, NY
* Beverly S. Lindsey, Avila College, Kansas City, MO

* Mary Ann McDermott, Loyola University of Chicago, IL
Charlotte S. McHenry, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS

* Elizabeth Jane Martin, University of Pittsburgh, PA

Midwestern Region (continued)

Lois Neuman, Prince Georges Community College, Largo, MD
* Sally W. Nicholson, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, NC
Janice A. Noack, St. Louis University, St. Louis, MO

* Lois J. Owen, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH

* Mary Jean Padgett, William Carey College, New Orleans, LA
* Sylvia Drake Paige, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH
Rita J. Payton, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO

Joyce E. Rader, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN
Betty K. Richardson, MacMurray College, Abilene, TX

Elaine C. Smith, University of Illinois-Peoria, IL
Betty Soave, Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights, KY
Rita Kisting Sparks, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, WI
* Justine J. Speer, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI
Mary Ann Stevenson, Lorain County Community College, Elyria, OH
Shirley R. Stevenson, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, KS

* Mary Tanner, College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, MN

* Claudette Varricchio, Loyola University of Chicago, IL
* Kathyrn L. Vigen, Huron College, Huron, SC

Willamay Whitner, University of Mississippi, Jackson, MS
* Tamara K. Williams, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH
* Martha A. Wittenauer, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS
* Judie Wood, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI
Judith A. Wood, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH
* Anne Woodtli, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, IL

Western Region

Marion Anema, Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX

* Charold Baer, University of Oregon Health Sciences Center at Portland, OR
P. Sherrill Baugher, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA
Betsy Bowman, University of Texas-Austin, TX
Jan Brewer, University of Texas-Austin, TX
* Gerald Brouder, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO

Western Region (continued)

* Barbara Carter, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA
Kathleen Chafey, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT
Marilyn B. Chassie, Baylor University, Waco, TX
Paula S. Cokingtin, Graceland College, Lamoni, IA

* Roslyn Elms, Massachusetts General Hospital Institute of Health Professions, Boston, MA
* Annette Ezell, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

Rebekah Fleeger, Biola College, La Mirada, CA
* Catherine Foster, University of San Francisco, CA
* Betsy Frank, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

Barbara Gaines, University of Oregon Health Sciences Center at Portland, OR
Remigia Aurora Garcia, Incarnate Word College, San Antonio, TX
Joan Goe, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX
Jean Goldsmith, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Joan Green, University of San Francisco, CA
Susan J. Grobe, University of Texas-Austin, TX

Beverly A. Hall, University of California, San Francisco, CA
* Luella Hefty, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA
Barbara Henthorn, Central State University, Edmond, OK
* Betty L. Hodo, University of Alaska, Anchorage, AK

Barbara Innes, Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, WA

Peggy Kiker, Texas Christian University, Forth Worth, TX
* Alice Kuramoto, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

* Irene D. Lewis, Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey, Newark, NJ
Anne Loustau, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
* Barbara L. Lust, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, TX

Rosemary K. McKevitt, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, TX
* Frank E. McLaughlin, University of California, San Francisco, CA

* Mineva Mayberry, California State University, Long Beach, CA
* Ronald Mitchell, Walla Walla College, Walla Walla, WA

* Sherrill Z. Nelson, Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID

Lee Pennington, University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, OK
Susan E. Pollock, University of Texas-Austin, TX
M. Jayne Powell, Incarnate Word College, San Antonio, TX

Western Region (continued)

Juliann T. Reakes, Angelo State University, San Angelo, TX
Joyce Roberson, University of Dubuque, IA

Donna Schantz, University of Oregon Health Sciences Center at Portland, OR
Ann L. Steck, Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX
R. Therese Sullivan, Carroll College, Helena, MT
* Jane Swart, University of Colorado at Denver, CO

Beth C. Vaughan-Wrobel, Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX
Patty Villarreal, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, TX

Robert L. Wilcox, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

AACN Officers and Board of Directors
Rose Marie Chioni, *President*, University of Virginia
Billye Brown, *President-Elect*, University of Texas-Austin
Elizabeth Grossman, *Treasurer*, Indiana University
Ira Trail Adams, *Secretary*, University of Tulsa
Linda K. Amos, *Member-at-Large*, University of Utah
Lorene Fischer, *Member-at-Large*, Wayne State University
Sr. Rosemary Donley, *Chairman*, Governmental Affairs Committee, The Catholic University of America
Gwendoline MacDonald, *Chairman*, Bylaws Committee, University of South Florida
Carmen Westwick, *Chairman*, Membership Committee, University of New Mexico
Gloria Smith, *Chairman*, Program Committee, University of Oklahoma

Headquarters Staff
Marion I. Murphy, *Executive Director*
Kip Lester, *Deputy Executive Director*
Gladys White, *Bookkeeper*
Hermie Manapsal, *Administrative Assistant*
Norita Thompson, *Secretary*

Project Staff
Ann M. Douglas, *Project Director*
Cecelia M. Cunilio, *Assistant Project Director*
Marion Whichard, *Secretary*
Manila Boyd, *Secretary*